THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

os, 7, 8 & 9 OCTOBER—DECEMBER, Vol. XXXV

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Oxford Conference and Episcopal Comments

The following correspondence arising out of the Oxford Modern Churchmen's Conference (August 13-18) appeared in *The Times*, August 18—September 26, 1945, under the heading 'Church and Churchman':—

[*August 18th.*]

Sir,—The Modern Churchmen have had their annual meeting, and once more, through the mouth of Sir Cyril Norwood, have told the Church of England what an inferior and old fashioned body it is. It would help us a good deal if he would be a little more explicit and tell us what part of our Christian faith we should give up in order to prevent 'the growing breach between the thought of the clergy and that of the people.'

I read a little book by Dr. Major on basic religion, and the chief thing he wanted us to do was to cease calling ourselves Christians. That did not seem to me very helpful nor likely to be popular. Will Sir Cyril Norwood be explicit and tell us what we are to believe and teach, if we are to be modern? Will he also tell us more explicitly how we are to promote Christian unity? The Lambeth Conference has laid down certain simple conditions for a united Church, the Bible, the Christian faith as contained in the Creed, the two sacraments, and a unified ministry. Under the authority of the Church I have taken part in conferences with Lutherans, with Old Catholics, with Orthodox (why is it wrong to be friendly to the Orthodox?), with Presbyterians, with English Nonconformists, and had friendly relations with other branches of Christianity. The whole attitude of what are called the Churches to one another has changed and is changing. Will he give us further advice as to what action we should take?

He is a little more explicit on political matters. He wants us to imitate Russia, and he thinks comfort more important than political or religious freedom. I have some acquaintance with young people, and I hardly think that that creed will attract them. Most of us think that as Christians we can do the best for mankind by teaching people the great Christian principles of righteousness, purity, service, sacrifice, duty and love rather than by becoming the mouthpiece of the popular ideology of the moment.

We know how superior the Modern Churchman is and what poor creatures we members of the Church of England are. Would he help us in our efforts at self-improvement? Yours, etc.,

A. C. GLOUCESTR.

[*August 21st.*]

Sir,—The intemperate and unfounded attack made upon me in your columns by the Bishop of Gloucester demands a reply. He was not present at my address to the Conference of Modern Churchmen: he has not read it. A brief newspaper report has touched off an explosion of anger and prejudice which does him little credit.

The Bishop first quotes with scorn, and puts in inverted commas, the sentence 'the growing breach between the thought of the clergy and that of the people.' Had he troubled to read my paper he would have known that this was a quotation from a resolution moved in the Convocation of York in May, 1944, by the Bishop of Carlisle, seconded by the Bishop of Southwell, and supported by the Archbishop of York. He would have discovered that my comment on this was that we should not be over-hasty in our judgments, and I commend this advice to the Bishop of Gloucester.

Next, after a reference to Dr. Major's *Basic Christianity*, ludicrous in its prejudice, he asks a number of rhetorical questions, which, being rhetorical, expect no answer. But parenthetically he does enquire, 'Why is it wrong to be friendly to the Orthodox?' and I can answer at once that it is not wrong. What is wrong is that we should be cool and unfriendly to English nonconformists. The Bishop quotes the Lambeth Conference of twenty-five years ago, but why, may I ask in my turn, are we farther away from union with the Free Churches than we were in 1920, and whose fault is it?

In a third paragraph the Bishop excels even himself. He writes of me: 'He wants us to imitate Russia, and he thinks comfort more important than political or religious freedom.' This statement is as false as it is unscrupulous: let anyone read my address, which will be published in the next number of the *Modern Churchman*, and see for himself. What I did say was that the young, in France, in broken-down Europe, in India, in China, were building castles of imagination for the future on the foundation of what they believed Russia to have achieved, and that they regarded Communism as a new faith for which they were ready to barter a good deal of freedom. I was really leading up to a commendation of Archbishop Temple for stressing the social gospel of Christianity, and I went on to poke fun at Communism, a political faith which, rightly or wrongly, has never attracted me.

One does not expect any educated man to use his pen so recklessly, and I can only recommend the Bishop of Gloucester to add to the impressive list of virtues with which he closes his letter—righteousness, purity, service, sacrifice, duty and love—the not less important and not less Christian virtues of tolerance and truth.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

CYRIL NORWOOD.

[*August 23rd.*]

Sir,—May I be permitted to reply briefly to Dr. Headlam's misrepresentation of my little book *Basic Christianity*? Dr. Headlam writes: 'I read a little book by Dr. Major on basic religion, and the chief thing he wanted us to do was to cease calling ourselves Christians.'

After a succinct exposition of the essentials of Jesus Christ's Gospel

of the Kingdom of God, I wrote: 'Would it not be well if we could substitute for "Christianity" the "Kingdom of God" as the name of our religion? Christianity is derived from a nickname "Christian" given to the disciples of Jesus by the wits of Antioch (Acts xi, 26). Like most nicknames it stuck, but it was a poor name for our religion compared with the Kingdom of God' (p. 40).

It is difficult to understand Dr. Headlam's antipathy to calling our religion the Kingdom of God, seeing that this was the name which Jesus himself gave to his own religion. 'The chief thing' I sought to do in *Basic Christianity* was to present the Christian religion as the religion the world needs to-day, and with that end in view I urged that the Christian Church should concentrate primarily on propagating the religion of Jesus himself rather than later ecclesiastical developments, accretions, and even perversions of that religion.

Yours, etc.,

H. D. A. MAJOR.

[*August 28th.*]

Sir,—I have carefully read through my letter, and I must own that I can find nothing to justify what Sir Cyril Norwood says of me—'intemperate,' 'an explosion of anger and prejudice,' 'using my pen recklessly.' No doubt it is galling for anyone in his position to have his infallibility questioned. I will, however, try to state simply why I resent the attitude of the people who call themselves Modern Churchmen to the Church of England and other religious bodies.

(1) I cannot find anything to justify the tone of intellectual superiority that they assume. I learnt my criticism and theology from Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Hort and others eminent for their learning. There are many theologians in the Church of England and among nonconformists of great distinction. I cannot find anything in the records of Sir Cyril Norwood or other speakers among the Modern Churchmen to justify the attitude of superiority that they assume.

(2) The constant attack on 'meaningless dogmas' seems to me foolish. Religion is based on 'beliefs,' and 'dogmas' are beliefs formulated in careful and accurate language. Beliefs are vital to religion. Instead of vague attacks upon dogma, will they tell us what beliefs we must give up and why? This is not a rhetorical question. The reality of the dogmas of the incarnation, the atonement, everlasting life, divine judgment are the life of Christianity. Are we to give up teaching them?

(3) Who are the laity? I am brought in contact with many thousands of devout Churchmen who love and work for the Church. If I taught them what the Modern Churchmen wish I should wound their consciences and drive them out.

(4) The Modern Churchmen would be more helpful if they would give us something constructive, rather than repeat each year well-worn criticisms. For instance, Dr. Inge tells us that he has difficulties in the moral teaching of the Old Testament. That is not very modern. It goes back to Marcion in the second century. But theologians in the Church of England and other religious bodies have devoted much thought to the Old Testament and enable us to enjoy its religious teaching without any offence to our intelligence.

(5) The problems of reunion are much less simple than Sir Cyril Norwood thinks. They appear, of course, quite easy to those who have learnt to disbelieve so many things as the Modern Churchman. Judging from my experience in the diocese, I do not think that our relations with

nonconformists have become colder. But there are difficulties and we have to deal with beliefs. For instance, the Baptist representatives at the Edinburgh conference, led by a layman, a K.C., insisted on the doctrine of 'believers' baptism'—I do not accept it, but it is not unreasonable—and therefore said that a necessary condition of a united Church would be the rebaptism of the Pope, the Ecumenical Patriarch, and the Archbishop of Canterbury.

May I say, in conclusion, that I do not think I am indifferent to truth—I have worked for sixty years to try to attain it—but I do not feel the necessity of looking upon Sir Cyril Norwood's statements as truth. I do not think I am intolerant—I would appeal to my many friends in many Christian Churches—but I am intolerant of the assumption of intellectual superiority made by the Modern Churchmen.

Yours, etc.,

A. C. GLOUCESTR.

[*August 30th.*]

Sir,—The Bishop of Gloucester seeks to transfer this issue to the realm of general discussion, but he cannot escape so easily. I brought certain specific charges against him, and to none of these does he offer any answer. I said first that he attacked me without either hearing or reading my address. To this I now add that he can have made no serious attempt whatever to find out what I really did say. Secondly, he quoted and poured contempt on a sentence, 'the growing breach between the thought of the clergy and that of the people,' which he wished your readers to suppose were words of mine; but they were not, but were the words of two of his colleagues on the bench of Bishops. As to this blunder, too, he thinks silence to be the wisest course. Thirdly, he said of me, 'He wants us to imitate Russia: he thinks comfort more important than political or religious freedom.' And I said that these statements were as false as they were unscrupulous. They are false because they are directly contrary to the truth, and they are unscrupulous because the Bishop must have known that, if he had stopped to think, he had no tittle of evidence to offer in support of his charges.

I said that he used his pen recklessly, because I thought that it was the most charitable thing that could be said of him, but he now apparently claims that all these false and unscrupulous statements were made after full deliberation. My own feeling is that the only proper course which the Bishop of Gloucester could have taken when his blunders and injurious false statements were pointed out to him was to say that he was sorry. But he has not taken this view of the matter, and I can only leave it to your readers to judge.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

CYRIL NORWOOD.

[*September 4th.*]

Sir,—In dealing publicly with serious subjects I have the greatest objection to giving my conclusions without giving my reasons. However, the Bishop of Gloucester's challenge to Modern Churchmen to state 'what beliefs we must give up and why' demands an answer.

As editor of the *Modern Churchman* for thirty years I have no knowledge of Modern Churchmen who do not believe in 'the incarnation, the atonement, everlasting life, divine judgment,' but I do know a great number of Modern Churchmen who do not believe in the virgin birth, in the resurrection of the physical body of Jesus Christ, in the descent of Jesus Christ into Hades between his death and resurrection, in his return

at the end of the world to judge the quick and the dead at a great assize, and in the raising of the bodies of the dead from their graves to be present on that occasion.

These beliefs are all affirmed in the Apostles' Creed, and have been held by orthodox Christians until recent times. In addition to these beliefs, a number of other beliefs taught in the great Churches of Christendom are not believed by Modern Churchmen, *e.g.* the verbal inspiration of scripture and its infallibility; the everlasting torment of the wicked in hell; the necessity of the sacraments (baptism and the Lord's supper) for individual human salvation; the expiatory sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the Cross; that, because of the fall of Adam and Eve, the whole human race is guilty of original sin and stands under the judgment of God.

If asked why Modern Churchmen do not believe these things, the reply is that modern biblical, historical and scientific studies have rendered them incredible.

Yours, etc.,

H. D. A. MAJOR.

[*September 6th.*]

Sir,—The Christian creeds, criticised in so cavalier a fashion by Dr. Major, are brief summaries of the undoubted teaching of Holy Scripture. The Scriptures in turn, constituting the classical documents of Christian faith, convey to mankind the revelation of God's 'word,' spoken by prophets 'in diverse fragmentary ways' and consummated in Jesus Christ, the Incarnate Lord, to whom the Scriptures bear witness. But the Scriptures are an oriental literature, Semitic in world-view, in phraseology and in modes of thought, non-modern and pre-scientific.

Those who, as educated modern men, accept and live by the Christian faith, must be continuously conscious of tension between the modern scientific world outlook and the scriptural insights by which it is challenged. The problems to which 'modernism' seeks to address itself are real problems, which recur, age after age, and which have been handled by successive generations of Christian teachers with varying success. But the problem cannot be solved in Dr. Major's fashion by the simple process of making a bald list of rejected doctrines to be discarded, with the implication that a limited number of less apparently challenging affirmations, traditional in Christianity, can still survive. There is need of a much deeper grappling with the problem constituted by the mutual challenge and tension between the two radically contrasted world-outlooks.

It is easier to be aware of this problem than to be immediately ready with a solution of it, even of a provisional and tentative kind. It is certainly impracticable to deal adequately with so large an issue within the brief compass of a letter to the Press. Yet I find myself bound to say that, as between the Bishop of Gloucester and Dr. Major, I find myself in agreement with the former to the extent of finding the all too facile rationalisms of Dr. Major wholly unsatisfying.

Yours, etc.,

JOHN DERBY.

[*September 26th.*]

Sir,—In reply to the Bishop of Gloucester's challenge, I felt compelled, on behalf of Modern Churchmen, to make a series of religious denials. May I, in response to the Bishop of Derby's criticism, make on behalf of Modern Churchmen a series of Christian affirmations? These affirmations are contained in a Modern Churchmen's Creed in the words of an ancient Churchman (St. John).

'We believe: God is Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. God is Light, and if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another. God is Love, and everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God. Jesus is the Son of God, and God has given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. We are children of God, and he hath given us of his spirit. If we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins. The world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.'

This creed, widely circulated for many years past, both at home and abroad, by the Modern Churchmen's Union, is, I believe, the truest expression of the Christian faith of Modern Churchmen.

Yours, etc.,
H. D. A. MAJOR.

From the ecclesiastical point of view, the most significant comment on the correspondence was that contributed by Dr. Kirk, Bishop of Oxford, to the *Oxford Diocesan Magazine* of Nov. 1.

Some weeks ago, a desultory little correspondence under the title 'Church and Churchman' was carried on by a number of distinguished Churchmen in the columns of *The Times*. I have not kept the letters, but I remember how one writer set out the creed of himself and his friends: they believed in certain doctrines, of which the titles only were given, without any statement of the sense which (in their minds) the words carried; they denied certain other fundamentals of the historic Christian faith, such as the virgin birth, the physical resurrection of our Lord, and the necessity of sacraments for salvation. I am afraid that an irresponsible fancy at once led me to consider the outline of a revised catechism for candidates for baptism, of which not the least important question would be 'Dost thou deny the virgin birth, the physical resurrection of Christ . . . and so forth?'; and no one would be admitted to Church membership unless he could reply with heartfelt enthusiasm, 'All this I stedfastly deny.' Seriously, however, I am alarmed at the degree to which, in a Church which needs constructive and positive thought and action as much at this time as ever before, destructive and negative partisanship still obtrudes itself.

No group within the Church is wholly free from this taint. We do not all nail doctrinal denials to our mast as gallantly as those of whom we have just been thinking. But the unedifying scenes which attended the confirmation and enthronement of the new Bishop of London show how easy it still is to organise a purely obstructive hostility against something of which the objectors disapprove; whilst in another wing of the Church there is a deadly and sterilising *non possumus* which betrays itself whenever the reconciliation of the sundered communions of Christendom is spoken of. There seem to be very many of us still who simply delight in being different from others. In a recent volume of reminiscence of the Victorian era an anecdote is told of two gentlemen of the old school staying at the same country house. After lunch each went out, faultlessly dressed, for a solitary constitutional in the spacious grounds. They met on the crown of a bridge spanning a sheet of ornamental water. Each with perfect courtesy took off his top hat and bowed to the other; each murmured 'What a pity we are not both going the same way'; then they passed each other and completed their walks, as planned, in companionless privacy. This seems to me an allegory of the parties within

the Church. Each says to the other 'What a pity we are not going the same way.' But I doubt whether in every case they really think it to be a pity; and certainly they do not always imitate the faultless gentility of the two Victorians.

. . . . . .

A report which is shortly to be presented to the Church Assembly deals with the all-important topic of the Conversion of England. I hope to write more about this on some future occasion; in the meantime I desire to say that I see no hope that the preaching of a creed composed in large part of arid negations will have any converting influence. We must be positive and constructive if we are going to win men and women for the Lord and His service; to tell them that they must disbelieve or discard this or that aspect of traditional Christianity will help them in no way whatsoever. There are of course points at which some simple or impressionable minds find stumbling blocks; but as a rule they are easily dealt with. If a thousand years with God are as a single day, and a day as a thousand years, it is natural to suppose that the 'days' of the first chapter of Genesis are not to be measured by twenty-four hours of clock-time; and if indeed that chapter and its surface chronology still present problems, it is desirable to give an explanation in some such terms as these. But points of this kind do not affect the substance of the historic gospel in any such way as it is impaired by denial of the virgin birth or the empty tomb.

. . . . . .

Another distinguished contributor to the correspondence in *The Times* suggested that every thoughtful person must be conscious of a 'tension' between historic Christian teaching and 'modern scientific thought.' Here we must consider very carefully what is really involved. I think that the words were written to provide a certain apology, though not by any means a full vindication, for those who deny such cardinal articles of the faith as I have mentioned. But actually all that they do is to introduce a new and dangerous element of confusion. Modern scientific thought investigates the constitution of the universe and the mechanism of its continuance in space-time; it does this by the comparison of the factors which go to make up that universe and their modes of activity. But historic Christianity speaks of a God who is one and unique, though also Three.* In the Person of his Son, God was once Incarnate among men; and by His one oblation of Himself, once offered on the cross, His Son—the one Lord Jesus Christ—made a full, perfect, sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. Further, by the operation of the Holy Spirit there is maintained in being a Church which is not only Holy, Catholic and Apostolic, but also One; in which Church we receive one Baptism for the remission of sins, and look for the Resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come.

Now as to all this science has nothing whatever to say. Its investigations are concerned with the constitution of the universe, and *ex hypothesi* God is outside the universe, of which He is at once the First and Final Cause. But further, even if God were wholly within His own Universe, there would be nothing with which to compare Him and His activities. The Christian creed, by its constant iteration of the keyword 'one,' insists that both God and His activities are unique and *sui generis*; they stand aloof from the processes of the universe; there is nothing whatever

*This appears to contradict the statement of the *Quicunque Vult*: 'and et they are not three Gods but one God.'—Ed., *M.C.*

with which they can be compared. Thus when, for example, our religion tells us that, in becoming incarnate, the Son of God was born of a Virgin, and after His death on the cross was raised from the dead, body, soul and spirit alike, the only way in which scientific thought could rebut these statements would be to compare *this* Incarnation with other historically established incarnations of God. But there have been no other incarnations; the incarnation of Jesus Christ is unique. No scientific investigation, therefore, can say 'It could not have happened thus.'

. . . . . .

To this it might be replied that there have in the past been superstitions and puerilities in the Christian tradition of which it has now been purged. That is true; but I suggest that this result has not been brought about either by 'modern' or by 'scientific' thought, but by the thought of the Christian Church itself reflecting upon its own experience under the steady illumination of the Holy Spirit of God. The apocryphal gospels at one time rivalled the canonical gospels in the enthusiasm with which they were accepted and believed; and the apocryphal gospels represented our Lord as on many occasions performing what can only be described as childish conjuring tricks. To the Church these alleged episodes soon came to be regarded as unworthy of the Christ with whom it came into constant communion in the sacraments: they were therefore discarded as unhistorical, and the 'gospels' which contained them were branded as untrustworthy. In so far as the historic traditions of Christianity have been cleansed, purged or pruned, the operative force has been neither 'modernity' nor 'science,' but Christianity itself. The 'tension,' in so far as there has been one, has not been between the Church and modern thought, but between a steady refinement and a crude conservatism within the Church itself. If we are told that science has disproved this or that element in the creed, the answer is perfectly straightforward. Within its own legitimate sphere science has not done, and cannot do, and does not aim at doing, anything of the kind.

K.O.

We have given the Bishop's comment in full as it illustrates the wide difference which separates traditionalism from modernism and emphasizes the need for the liberating, clarifying and unifying endeavours of the Modern Churchmen's Movement.

As the Scientist sees It.

How the problem of the relation of the scientist to the dogmatic theologian strikes a scientist, who is intensely interested in the teaching of Religion as well as Science, is admirably explained by the President of the Science Masters' Association (C. L. Bryant, M.A., B.Sc.) in his recent Presidential Address entitled 'The Impact of Science on Human Beliefs, published in the *School Science Review* (No. 100, June 1945).

Mr. Bryant recognizes that some points of contact and even of conflict between scientists and dogmatic theologians can be safely discussed by them,

'but there are other subjects on which it is extremely difficult to open a discussion. Such gifts as we could bring would be considered as hand-

grenades. For example, let me quote one sentence which the Bishop of Bradford wrote in his *What the Church Teaches* (Penguin Special, p. 42). Speaking of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth of our Lord, he said that "there is no evidence against it save that which comes from the intrusion of biological science into a department that does not belong to it." That is a most astonishing statement, however you look at it. This attitude on the part of those who consider it their duty to defend the frontiers of religion from invasion by scientists is wholly to be deplored. Sometimes they offer the cheap jibe that science itself is untrustworthy, because time after time it has overthrown its own theories, and the scientific truth of to-day becomes the untruth of to-morrow. That should leave us unshaken. Its insistence on truth, truth at any price, is the outstanding contribution which science has made to human thought. We know that the urge to seek truth is within us; and that, in our own domain as scientists, it leads us forward, rather unsteadily forward perhaps, but still forward, at an ever-increasing rate. Would that those who are responsible for the examination and portrayal of religious beliefs were equally sensitive to such inspiration.'

Mr. Bryant judges that it is the traditional Creeds, used dogatically, which are in no small degree responsible for this unientific spirit in the Churches. He writes:

'So long as there are Creeds there are sure to be obstruction and exclusiveness.'

Vhat Mr. Bryant deplores is not that Christians in various stages development should believe as historically true things which e really poetic myths, but what he deplores is that debatable and iite secondary points should have been magnified into essential ticles of belief.

'There are many, within the Churches as well as without, who regret the false emphasis which is laid upon them. The Bishop of Truro, for example, in his little Penguin Special, *The Gospel for To-morrow*, has suggested that "the recital of the Creed should be made optional, and a shorter alternative form, more in accordance with modern thought, should be provided."'

In a recent letter, Canon England aptly writes in regard to the rrespondence in *The Times* published above:

'As one who believes that closer unity of Christendom can only be attained on a basis of Truth combined with an earnest desire for mutual understanding, I should like to point out what I believe to be the danger of "dogmas" in general, as opposed to "doctrines."

Dr. Headlam defines a dogma as a belief "formulated in careful and accurate language," but he implies that this accuracy in the statement of a belief renders the dogma infallible and fit for use as a final test of "orthodoxy."

This is a common attitude among those who call themselves "Catholic" whether Roman or Anglican, and fosters intolerance.

If the custodians of the Faith would adopt the more humble attitude of scientists in their search for Truth they would learn the necessity of modifying some ancient beliefs "formulated in careful and accurate language," and by applying themselves to the revision of "dog mas"

they would commend their intelligence to their more thoughtful critics who are sensitive to progressive enlightenment.'

We are glad to note that Dean Matthews — who has just been elected prolocutor of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury—pleaded in a recent debate (according to the *Church Times*, November 18) that

'We should aim at returning to the simplicity of the early Church, and ask no more elaborate affirmation from those who would join our fellowship than that which was sufficient for the converts of St. Paul: "Jesus is Lord."'

We hope that before it is too late the Church of England will set an example to all the Churches of Christendom by returning to this apostolic and truly Catholic simplicity.

Our Anglican Papalists.

Surely there can be no harm in English Churchmen praying for reunion with the Papal Church. Christian Reunion is an urgent need and Christian prayer for it is a duty. Yet there is danger that those who offer such prayers may be charged with disloyalty to the Church of England. Are we lacking in Charity if we suspect the loyalty to the Church of England of those promoters of the 'Church Unity Octave' who invite and exhort their fellow-Churchmen to pray for

'the reunion of all Christians into the Visible Kingdom of Christ, preserved in Unity by the Chair of St. Peter, the central See of Christendom at Rome.'

The following passages from their 'Annual Call,' just issued, makes their position perfectly clear:

'Founded nearly thirty years ago when the Church Unity Octave had its beginnings . . . then, and throughout the generation which is almost past, an ever-growing number of people have reached the conclusion that the only answer is the return of the Church of England to Union with that Authority which guided men during the first fifteen hundred years of the Christian Era.

'The guidance of the Holy Spirit — the infallibility of the Church — was promised only to those Catholics who abide in the Divinely assured unity of the body, *i.e.* the Body headed by the Chief Shepherd—the Chief Shepherd appointed by Christ Himself: those who have been separated from this Shepherd must suffer the penalty in diminution of their privileges.

'Realizing that the Church of England is still the largest religious factor in the country, and burdened by the responsibility of answering this call, the Council of the Church Unity Octave was moved to declare openly, that the only solution is to return to the Divinely-appointed Source of Truth, and so to regain for the smitten shepherds and the scattered sheep the security of the Fold of the Catholic Church. Only so can our people, and, indeed, the whole world, safely be gathered into the Heavenly Kingdom.'

Their two chief guiding principles are as follows:

'(1) The conversion of the world depends upon the Visible Unity of the Church of God, for our Father (*sic*) prayed "That they all may be one . . . and the World may believe.'

(2) He provided the means for the maintenance of this Unity by the appointment of a visible head of the visible Body: "Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church."

History has shown that whatever interpretation the Church has given to this text, for none other has ever been the Church's acknowledged head upon earth but he who sits on Peter's Throne. Separation from this centre of Unity has always led the separated into further schisms, while acknowledgment of it by all must necessarily result in the healing of all divisions.'

With the purpose of securing the effectual prayers of the faithful to this end, the following directions are issued:

'It is most important that all should persevere in this work of intercession throughout the year.

(1) Let us place the Octave and our work for the cause under the patronage of Our Lady of Walsingham.

(2) Let the Mass *Ad tollendum schisma* or a Mass with that intention be celebrated regularly in our churches and people led to make a rule of attending it.

(3) Let the faithful offer a Mass weekly or monthly for the cause.

(4) Let there be much clearer teaching as to Faith in every Church that the successor of Peter is the Divinely ordained centre of Unity and head of the hierarchy on earth.

The President of the Church Unity Octave Council is the Rt. Rev. Bishop Vibert Jackson, and its Chairman the Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton. These Anglican Papalists—as they call themselves—in advertising their papers, tractates and periodical, conclude their appeal with the following plea:

'In view of the grave menace to the Church in the Scheme for Protestant Union in South India, we urge the Clergy to purchase and disseminate the leaflets and pamphlets published by the Council for Defence of Church Principles.'

It is hard not to conclude that the only real interest which Churchmen of this school feel towards our Church's efforts to secure reunion with the Free Churches at home and abroad is to hold those efforts up and defeat them.

The Conversion of 'Post-Christian' England.

The energy and sincerity of Dr. Chavasse, Bishop of Rochester, secured for him a well-deserved ovation from the Church Assembly at its recent session: but the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Evangelism* for which the Bishop of Rochester was mainly responsible secured a mixed welcome. No money was

* *Towards the Conversion of England*, pub. P.P.B.C.A., 1/-, 1945.

voted by the Church Assembly — the surest indication in an English gathering of its real feeling towards projected plans. Instead the Report was commended by the Assembly to the serious attention of Parochial Church Councils. This means, we take it, that evangelization of England will have to begin in the parishes under the leadership of the parochial clergy or under the leadership of diocesan committees and Bishop's Messengers. That will avoid the creation of a central organization in the metropolis and the accompanying expense, delay and red tape. The Report is a sincere and earnest document and expresses the views of a body of Churchmen (clerical and lay), mainly evangelical in churchmanship, who are keenly sensitive to the growing desertion of the Church, by the people, which the Report perhaps is too ready to identify with the desertion of the Christian Religion by the English nation. It believes, however, that it is within the power of the ten per cent. within the churches, if really roused to a sense of Christian duty, to win the ninety per cent. who are outside.

The Report makes many proposals as to the form this evangelism might take. We have no quarrel with these proposals, save with that which would expend a million of money on religious advertisement. Most of the proposals, however, seem to us to promise little success. They have been effective in the past, but something more is needed to-day. The 'something more' is the reunion of the Christian denominations in this country under the leadership of the National Church. This we have maintained ought to be done at once by inviting all communicants of all Christian denominations to become *also* communicants in our cathedrals and parish churches, where they would receive a cordial welcome. The other part of this 'something more' is the simplification of Christian Doctrine and the refusal to demand, for purposes of universal Christian fellowship, anything beyond the great essentials of the Christian Faith — faith in God the Father, the Lord Jesus and the Holy Spirit.

Without these two preliminary conditions, we can see no prospect of successfully accomplishing the conversion of England to practising membership in the Christian Church. We do not underestimate the difficulty of achieving the two preliminary conditions we have named: their accomplishment would demand much courage, much wisdom, much love and great powers of leadership. We should like to believe that these qualifications are latent in our National Church and that only the urgency of the present crisis is needed to bring them into action forthwith.

Putting the Church's purse in order is the duty of our lay people; but the duty of an Apostolic Ministry is to devote itself to tasks more difficult and more dangerous.

IN MEMORIAM

CHARLES JOHN SHEBBEARE

On October 15, in his sleep, Charles John Shebbeare — a very
d member of the Modern Churchmen's Union — passed away in
s 81st year. He belonged to a well-known family, one of whose
embers was granted a pension by George III at the same time
at Dr. Johnson received his pension. 'The King' — so a wit
nounced — 'has given a pension to a he-bear and to a she-bear
the same day.'

Mr. Shebbeare graduated at Christ Church, Oxford: he was
dained in 1888, and after holding a number of pastoral cures
as presented to Stanhope by the Crown in 1921, when he also
ecame Chaplain to the King. Although a man of many interests,
nd delighting in social intercourse, yet his mind was essentially
nilosophical and he was attracted by the more profound prob-
ms of theology. A vivid description of him was contributed in a
tter to *The Times* of November 7 by his life-long friend, Prof.
. C. J. Webb.

'As the Rev. Dr. C. J. Shebbeare's intimate friend for over sixty years I should like to add a few words to the excellent obituary published in *The Times*. He was a man whose personality made on those brought into association with him a very powerful impression. He had a mind of rare originality and independence and a remarkable gift for philosophical speculation combined with exceptional readiness in discussion and debate. His *Religion in an Age of Doubt*—in some ways the best of his books—would have attracted more attention had not its publication unfortunately coincided with the outbreak of war in 1914. His principal contribution to philosophical theology was probably his development in *The Challenge of the Universe* (1918) and *The Design Argument Reconsidered* (1923), a debate with Mr. Joseph McCabe, afterwards published in America as *The Revelation of God in Nature*, of the argument that the only alternative to regarding the beauty of nature as accidental is the view that the world is governed by ideals, a conclusion which he held to justify the belief in the Christian's God. His lifelong delight in Greek and Latin literature, his profound knowledge of Shakespeare and love of Italian poetry, his familiarity with Kant and Hegel, with the moral theology of the Roman Catholic schools and with the literature of popular Evangelicalism, the active Liberalism of his middle life, his great knowledge of music and his enjoyment of field sports, illustrate the breadth and variety of his interests. One who knew him well in later years has written: "His humour and good companionship, his versatility, and his gifts as a conversationalist will always be remembered by those who knew him: but deeper than all these things was his unmistakable personal religion and his charity of judgment. His friends have lost a friend indeed.'

H.D.A.M.

CHURCHIANITY OR CHRISTIANITY FOR GERMANY?

By Diedrich Meyer-Klügel, D.Jur., German Reformed Pastor, Birmingham

THERE is much talk about re-education of Germany, and there are various plans, partly already in operation, for Christian re-education and re-construction in Germany. However, what is needed in and for Germany is not *re*-education and *re*-construction, *i.e.* the restoration of the things as they were before the Nazi regime, but complete *new*-education and *new*-construction. For Nazism has its roots deep in Germany's past, and unless these are eradicated and something quite new and better is sown on clean ground, the same trouble will spring out all over again.

Nazism is nothing new. Nazism is totalitarianism, and that is as old as the State itself; it is, in fact, more or less the innate tendency of every State. Thus we find totalitarianism as far back as in the earliest writings of the Old Testament, and the old fable of the trees who sought for a king (*Judges* ix, 5-21) is perhaps the strongest condemnation of any totalitarian regime. The totalitarian State, that is what the Prophets of Israel were fighting against: the totalitarian State sanctioned and supported by the institutional Church. And Jesus himself went to the Cross because he had come into conflict with Jewish nationalism, and with the church-parties which either for their wealth's sake sympathized with the Roman Empire or for patriotic reasons longed for a Jewish national victory. Almost all the States of ancient times were totalitarian; the State was the highest good, its sovereignty was omnipotent and all-embracing, unlimited and illimitable, it claimed the whole life of all its subjects, the inward as well as the outward life. To live for the State and to die for it was the sum of all virtues, and all ancient pagan religions culminated in the last issue in idolizing and worshipping the State and its power. The mediaeval State was a universal State which almost coincided with the Church, and it was the Church that exercised or at least claimed absolute supremacy. But at the end of the Middle Ages the worldly State began again to claim its sovereignty, and the modern State, the National State, arose. In a sense it was re-discovered, like the many works of classical art and literature which were revived by the Renaissance, and it was welcomed with no less enthusiasm. The new and yet so old ideal of a powerful, autono-

ous and totalitarian State was first proclaimed by Machiavelli in s book *The Prince*. He taught that Christianity with its praise of eekness, renunciation and suffering love had weakened men, and contended that those who believed in moral laws should keep from politics; politics had nothing to do with ethics, experience ther than right had to be followed; the criterion had to be: What ofits or what harms the nation? and not: What is good or what evil?

Troeltsch in his great work *The Social Teaching of the ristian Churches and Groups** pointed out that Luther seems to ve drawn his doctrine of the State greatly from Machiavelli. In ct, Luther's writings in which he took sides with the German rinces in the horrible massacre of the German peasants are even orse than anything Machiavelli wrote. Luther was not only a ligious reformer, but first of all a German nationalist; the tional idea was already foremost in his struggle against the ading in indulgences (which was the starting-point of his Reformation), and it dominated more or less all his life and work. here is thus much truth in it, if Luther is regarded as the spiritual cestor of Frederick II ('the Great') of Prussia, Bismarck and itler. His violent anti-Semitism (*cf.* W. 53, 502, 521, E. 32, 141) s scarcely been surpassed even by the notorious Jew-baiter reicher. And again and again he made the end justify the eans, not only by purposely inserting, omitting or misinterpreting words in his translation of the Bible, but even by sanctioning ownright lying, saying: 'What harm could it do, if a man told a od lusty lie in a worthy cause and for the sake of the Christian hurches?' 'To lie in a case of necessity or for convenience or in cuse — such lying would not be against God; He was ready to ke such lies on Himself' (Lenz, *Briefwechsel*, Vol. I, pp. 373, 5).

Luther's standpoint is that 'civilian life does not concern God,' is only the salvation of the individual soul that matters, the orld is and will remain the Devil's. The basic principle of uther's teaching is *Rom.* iii, 28: 'We reckon therefore that a an is justified by faith alone apart from the works of the law.' uther says:

> 'Christianity is nothing but a continual exercise in feeling that you have no sin, although you sin, but that your sins are thrown on Christ. He becomes the sinner in your stead.' 'Be a sinner, and sin boldly.' 'Sometimes it is necessary to commit sin out of hatred and contempt for the Devil.'

* Abridged E.T., *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*; 2 vols., blished by G. Allen & Unwin, 1931.

Whatever biblical truth there may be in the principle of 'justification by faith,' when it is over-accentuated — what Luther did by inserting the word 'alone' contrary to the original text — and made the centre of the Christian religion, it becomes a source of great danger. For the egocentric and eudaemonistic attitude, 'What must I do to be saved?' is entirely different from what Christ demands, when he calls us to follow him and help to conquer the world for God and the Righteousness of His Kingdom. Its result is a great indifference and unconcern towards the world and all social and political problems, a complete divorce between private religion and public affairs. But, furthermore, to Luther the State is divinely ordained; he consequently demands absolute obedience towards the State in all political matters, saying that in so far it is not for man to judge, but only for God. This conception of the State as 'a power ordained by God' has been the cause of a persistent conservatism among the Lutherans, or an acquiescence in the existing conditions and an uncritical acceptance of any powers that be, even a gang of robbers and murderers, whilst freedom is claimed only for the inner world of the soul and the spiritual sphere of the Church. Luther says:

> 'Wherever the princes take their power from, it does not concern us. It is the will of God, irrespective of whether they have stolen their power or assumed it by robbery' (W.30, 1). 'If anybody has the might, he obtained it from God. Therefore he has also the right.' 'Even if the authorities are wicked and unjust, nobody is entitled to oppose them, or to riot against them.' 'The ass must have blows, and the people must be ruled by force.'

It is highly questionable whether there is any support for Luther's doctrine of the State in Paul's teaching (*Rom.* xiii). At any rate Jesus takes a quite different view in his reply to the question concerning tribute to Caesar: 'Render to Caesar the things which are Caesar's, but give to God the things which are God's,' for that means: Caesar may have his penny which bears his name and image, but man bears God's image and thus belongs to God with body and soul. And that is quite in line with the teaching of the prophets of the Old Testament (*e.g. Is.* iii, 14-15; *Judges* viii, 22-23; ix, 7-15; *I Sam.* viii, 10-17; *II Sam.* xi-xii; *I Kings* xxi,; *Hos.* x, 3-4).

Luther's attitude to violence and war is:

> 'Wars are right and divine. It is Christian and a work of love not to go slowly in a war. One must cut the throats of one's enemies, pillage them, burn them, do everything that may do them harm until one has beaten them' (W.11, 277).
>
> 'Only a simpleton argues that it is not Christian to strangle and to rob and that it is no work of love. But in truth it is a work of love' (W.19, 625).

th such principles Luther sanctioned the slaughter of more n 100,000 freedom-loving peasants whom he first had encour-ed and through whose support he himself and his Reformation d come to power. The rising of these peasants was the first great uggle of the German people for freedom and democracy. It was eceded by the feud of Sickingen and his friends, who challenged developing absolutism of the princes and were defeated. In 25 the peasants rose. They had heard of the new freedom, tice and peace preached by Humanists like Erasmus and some the Reformers (especially the Swiss, but also Luther, who had oclaimed 'the freedom of the Christian' and in the beginning d said sharp words against the princes and lords), and they nted to put these ideas into practice. They felt that only through plication to the ordinary daily life of the common man these eas would get a real meaning. They did not like half-way easures, and quite rightly feared that in spite of all noble ideas umanism and Reformation would get stuck unless a complete ange in all spheres of life was achieved. Things started in vitzerland, which thanks to the greater open-mindedness of the iss Reformation to social and political problems (especially vingli wanted to conquer the whole world in all its aspects for d's Kingly Rule) was the centre of progressive thought. The asants demanded the abolition of all institutional churchianity a return to the plain and true teaching of Jesus, subordination all life, public as well as private life, to God's holy laws, free-n of faith and worship, abolition of serfdom and villeinage, titution of the land to the old village communities, use of the e for purposes of the communities only, free hunting and fish-, just administration of justice. The movement spread, and n some progressive knights joined it. The princes, striving to ome absolute monarchs, were not prepared to tolerate such ngs. Luther owed his life to some of them, and with their help l saved the cause of his Reformation. He was their grateful and dient servant now. He asked the peasants to drop all their ms; only the freedom of Protestant worship should be granted hem. The peasants were very disappointed, and it was easy for icalists now to take the lead. But all that the peasants did is weighed a thousandfold by what the armed forces of the princes after Luther had advised them:

> 'Come, dearly-beloved lords and nobles, strike them, transfix them, and cut their throats with might and main. Should you find death in so doing, you would fall in obedience to God and in defending your like against the hordes of Satan.'

In the same year 1525 it came to a breach between Lutheran-

ism and Humanism, because Luther denied the free will of man, as well as to a breach between Lutheranism and the Swiss Reformation (Zwingli), because Luther insisted that Christ is present in the bread and wine on the Communion table.

The result of these happenings was that Lutheranism became more and more reactionary and other-worldly. The next to be destroyed by fire and sword were the Anabaptists, not so much because they objected to infant baptism, but because they were pacifist Communist Christians. After that nobody dared to stand up against the Lutherans and their powerful supporters, the German princes. Free Christianity never got a chance to develop in Germany; the influence of liberal and modern theologians like Harnack, Troeltsch, Lietzmann, Rade, Vischer, Gunkel, Baumgartner, Liechtenhan and others remained purely academic. Students with liberal or modern views never passed the theological examinations held by the Consistories (the Church authorities in which all the administrative, judicial and disciplinary functions of the various regional or provincial German Protestant Churches are centralized) and demanded from candidates for the ministry. Pastors with such views were very often dismissed as 'heretics,' especially in 1892 during the great controversy about the Apostolic Creed produced by the publication of Harnack's critical treatise on the Apostles' Creed. Also political Liberalism was nipped in the bud. It was the second great struggle of the German people for freedom and democracy, and was stamped out by the Machiavellian Nihilist Bismarck, whom the Lutherans worship as their greatest statesman.

The great German philosophers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, almost all of them, followed Luther in his ideas about the State. To Kant 'the supreme Power in the State has only rights and no duties towards the subject.' 'Resistance on the part of the people to the supreme legislative power of the State is in no case legitimate. . . . There is no right of sedition and still less of rebellion belonging to the people. Least of all, when the supreme power is embodied in an individual monarch, is there any justification, under the pretext of his abuse of power, for seizing his person or taking away his life. . . . It is the duty of the people to bear any abuse of the supreme power, even though it should be considered unbearable' (*Phil. of Law*, 175-177). Fichte, calling the community of blood, language and country — the 'fatherland' or the 'nation' — the highest good and identifying righteousness before God with feeling, thinking and acting for one's country foreshadows the Nazi myths of race, blood and soil. Hegel's doctrine of the absolute State is directly derived from Luther. H

ls the State 'the march of God in the world,' 'the Divine Idea it exists on earth' and 'the Divine Will as a present spirit, ich unfolds itself in the actual shape of an organized world' *hilosophy of Right*, 247, 160; *Philosophy of History*, 41). eitschke, the historian of Greater Prussia, had similar views. etzsche, the son of a Lutheran pastor, proclaimed — repeating achiavelli—that 'Christianity is the one great blemish of man- nd' and that it had led to 'the rule of the far too many.' He nts a 'revaluation of all values,' the Christian ethic which he lls 'the ethic of decadent slaves' shall be replaced by the ethic the super-man, *i.e.* power, violence. From there it is not far to e dilettante philosophers Houston Chamberlain (the son-in-law Richard Wagner) and Alfred Rosenberg. To Chamberlain uthor of *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century*) the nation, termined by race, blood and soil, is the centre. Everything that incompatible with the feeling of the nation or the race is to be terminated. Thus instead of Christianity, a new Germanic igion, based on the Germanic race and soil, is to be established the only recognized and allowed State-religion. Rosenberg in s *Mythus of the Twentieth Century* had only to dot the i's and oss the t's.

The Lutheran influence in Germany has proved the more dis- trous because the German Churches are established Churches. here are about 63 per cent. Protestants, about 32 per cent. oman Catholics, about 4 per cent. non-Christians, and only 1 per nt. Free Church people (independent Lutherans, independent eformed, Methodists, Baptists, Quakers, Salvation Army, etc.). he Protestants have 28 different provincial or regional Churches, ly loosely united in the German Evangelical Church League. me of these Churches (*e.g.* those under the Bishops Marahrens Hanover, Wurm of Würtemberg and Meiser of Bavaria) are utheran, others (*e.g.* those of Ostfriesland, part of Hessia and e Palatinate) are Reformed, the majority (*i.e.* those of the pre- 66 provinces of Prussia) are United Lutheran and Reformed in far as they are united under the same administration. In Austria ere were more than 90 per cent. Roman Catholics, and the utheran minority — violently Pan-German — has become the azi vanguard. The establishment of the German Churches ans for the Protestant Churches that at the time of the princes ese princes were the Primates of their respective Churches, t even the Republic controlled the Churches by far-reaching hts of consent, permission, sanction, ratification and vote, cause the State gives considerable subventions (as a kind compensation for the greater part of the Churches' landed pro-

perty which was secularized after the Napoleonic wars) and because the State also collects the church-tax for the Churches (10 per cent. additional to the income-tax). Everybody in Germany is and remains a member of the Church of his district, unless he goes to a law-court or a commissioner of oaths and makes a formal declaration that he wants to resign from membership.

As in other countries, there are different schools and parties within the German Protestant Churches: Orthodox, Liberals, Modernists, Socialists, Pacifists, etc. Under the Nazis the last two were banned and their leaders imprisoned, and two new parties came into existence—the 'German Christians' and the 'Confessional Church.' The first wanted to Nazify also the doctrines and institutions of the Church, whilst the latter wanted to adhere to the old Creeds and Confessions and thus was created the old and new Orthodox Liberals, Modernists and those who had belonged to the Christian Socialists and Pacifists hardly supported it. The 'Confessional Church' is therefore not a Church, still less *the* German Protestant Church, but only a party within the German Protestant Church, and—compared with the whole number of Christian people in Germany—a minority.

The 'Confessional Church' is by no means an anti-Nazi movement; on the contrary, they welcomed and supported the Nazi revolution whole-heartedly. They kept silent in the presence of all Nazi terror, and sanctioned and blessed the war not less than the 'neutral' Lutherans of the so-called 'intact Churches' under Marahrens, Wurm and Meiser, or even the 'German Christians.'

The so-called 'church struggle' was only for a 'theological existence,' *i.e.* a kind of ecclesiastical 'reservation-park' or a quiet corner where Confessions and Rites could be practised within the Third Reich. (See the *Declaration of Barmen* of 1934 and Karl Barth's *Theological Existence To-day*, wherein Barth says that his concern is only theology and nothing but theology—'like the monks go on with their litanies'—and that Hitler must be given a chance because he had proved to be a real leader.) In November 1933 the Protestant Churches, with the consent also of the 'Confessionals,' voluntarily offered the incorporation of all Church Youth Guilds into the Hitler Youth Organizations, even before the Nazis had asked the Churches to do so. In 1935 even Barth (then a professor of Bonn University) was prepared to take the oath of absolute loyalty and unconditional obedience to Hitler, after his 'Confessional' friends (Niemöller and others) had told him that there was no harm in doing so, as long as he made the *mental* reservation that loyalty to God comes first. It was not before 1939 that Barth—by then professor of Basle University, in

own country, Switzerland—began to discover what Nazism ly meant.

Many of the 'Confessionals' were members of the Nazi Party, n of the S.A. There were swastikas on and in the 'Confes- nal' churches and in the 'Confessional' meetings. Not seldom re were S.A. men in uniform as chairmen of these meetings, and re was no 'Confessional' meeting which did not express its olute loyalty to Hitler and his regime through resolutions or grams sent to Hitler.

In 1938 also the 'Confessional Church' adopted the 'Aryan' use. That is why the 'Confessional' refugee pastors are in tain; all of them are Lutherans and had to leave Germany be- se they or their wives are what is called 'non-Aryans'; real nfessional' refugees do not exist.

In the same year 1938 also the 'Confessional' pastors and rch officials (with the exception of a very few courageous out- ers) took the oath of absolute loyalty and unconditional obedi- e to Hitler.

Niemöller and other nationalist churchmen had made treaties n the Nazis for mutual support, the Nazis promising increased te subventions as well as the restoration of the inspection of schools by the Churches. According to one of his admirers o Stein, *I was in Hell with Niemöller*) Niemöller said: 'We e all very favourably impressed with his (Hitler's) talk and n his apparent modesty, and he gave his solemn word of honour t he would do what he said.'

Quarrels began when the Nazis later broke some of their dges. But even then the 'Confessionals' continued again and in to express their absolute loyalty to Nazism as such, so also heir very cautiously generalized and rather late 'protest' of y 1936, which is always quoted as *the* example of their sistance,' but in which criticism of anti-Christian ideas and centration camps is mixed with repeated expressions of deep- reverence for the Führer Hitler and of trust in him and his ds.

The backbone of the 'Confessional Church' is the German d particularly the Prussian) officer caste; even men like Count werin von Krosigk and Schacht attended its services. There- e pastors of the 'Confessional Church' were amongst those spirators who in July 1944 tried to murder Hitler and to re- ce him by a military dictator, either Göring or one of the erals.

How reactionary and pro-Nazi the German Lutheran Churches e is illustrated by three typical disciplinary cases. In 1899

Pastor Christoph Blumhardt was requested by the Church of Würtemberg to resign and to stop calling himself a pastor because he had expressed his sympathy with Trade Unionism in a workers' meeting. In 1930 Pastor Eckert, a Socialist and Pacifist, was dismissed by the Church of Baden for 'having insulted the old Imperial Army' (when at the General Assembly he spoke against secret re-armament); the Nazis later imprisoned him with hard labour, and nothing was heard of him again. In 1932 Pastor Mattiat of the Lutheran Church of Hanover, a Nazi, professed in a big meeting that

> 'we must support and join Nazism for Germany's sake, even if it were the cause of the devil.'

Nothing happened to him, because he was a 'noble patriot'; after 1933 he became a high church official and professor of theology.

Niemöller is the prototype of a Prussian officer and of a Lutheran nationalist.

> 'The national idea was almost foremost in his upbringing and by nature he had a leaning towards the Right. Love of his profession as an officer was a matter of course to him, and he was in his element in the war' (Niemöller, *From U-boat to Pulpit*, written as late as 1934—London, 1936—p. 9. The purpose of this book was to show the Nazis what good patriots and militarists the 'Confessionals' were.)

He glories in his deeds as a submarine officer and commander, even in downright war crimes like the prevention of the rescue of torpedoed sailors, which he goes so far as to call the 'turning point' of his life because, as he says, 'it opened my eyes to the utter impossibility of a moral universe' (*ibid.*, pp. 56-57; *cf.* Luther's ideas about sinning and sin). He retired in 1918 from active service because, as he says, 'with the abolition of conscription an officer's career had no further attraction for me' (*ibid.*, p. 151).

Niemöller hated the German Republic and democracy.

> 'He belonged with all his heart to the enemies of the Weimar Republic.'
>
> 'Their (*i.e.* the Nazi's) programme for a national revival was fundamentally his own, with its vehement denial of all that was meant by individualism, parliamentarianism, pacifism, Marxism and Judaism.' (*Niemöller and his Creed*, by one of his close friends, with a foreword by the Bishop of Chichester; London, 1939.)

The general strike of the German workers in 1920, which was in support of the lawfully established and constitutional democratic government, was 'perfectly disgraceful' to him, and in the 'White Terror' against these workers he commanded a Free Corps battalion. When the 'Reds' taken prisoner by the Free Corps were not summarily shot at the 'White' headquarters,

'there was a tacit understanding amongst the troops that no further prisoners would be sent back' to them, and the prisoners were liquidated on the spot in one way or the other (*From U-boat to Pulpit*, p. 714 ff.).

ıe 'White Terror' was the beginning of the 'Brown Terror,' d the workers were fighting to avert what then developed into tlerism. Whilst studying theology in Münsted, Niemöller was e of the organisers of the notorious 'Organisation Escherich' *rom U-boat to Pulpit*, p. 187). This nationalist terror organisa- n was one of the main nuclei of the S.A., S.S. and Gestapo. ven after he had become a deacon he did not stop being a war- ɔnger, but was almost on the point of taking a ship with illegal ınitions to the Turks (then at war with Greece); only by mere ance someone else got the job at the last moment, and the ship ıs seized by the British Dardanelles control (*From U-boat to ılpit*, pp. 187-188). Bishop Meiser of Bavaria also took an active rt in nationalist and counter-revolutionary activities against the erman Republic.

Niemöller became an ardent Nazi. He 'welcomed January th, 1933, from the bottom of his heart as the fulfilment of erished hopes' (*Niemöller and his Creed*, p. 33). When thou- nds of anti-Nazis and Jews were tortured and murdered in the ncentration camps, Niemöller thanked the Führer from his lpit:

> 'We again feel ourselves created beings. Profession and social standing, race and nationality are to-day again being regarded by us as important facts' (*First Commandment*, pp. 58-59).

ɔng after Hitler had come to power, Niemöller told his congre- tion (consisting mainly of members of the higher officer caste) the 'divine call in Hitler's spiritual revolution which is begin- ıg to take place throughout the whole of our nation' (*ibid.*). He arrelled with Hitler and the Nazis only about matters of church ministration, telling him:

> 'We are not driven by care for our Church, but much more by care for the Third Reich' (*Niemöller and his Creed*, p. 36).

e was sent to prison and concentration camp because he broke e laws of the State which had forbidden the taking of unauthor- ed collections and the announcing from the pulpit of the names people who had resigned from church membership. In the con- ntration camp he was never treated as an anti-Nazi, but, backed the officer caste, always was in a privileged position. It is worthy note also that chief Nazis like Thyssen and Schacht were in concentration camp. Children of anti-Nazis were thrown into ncentration camps like their fathers: Niemöller's sons were icers in the Nazi forces.

From out of the concentration camp Niemöller offered his services as a naval officer to the Nazis at the outbreak of war (see already Karl Barth in *The Christian Century*, May 6, 1940). He himself admitted this fact, which has constantly been denied or doubted by the 'Confessional' propaganda. His excuses are:

> 'If sons can die for their country, so can fathers. Germany could have my body, but not my soul.
>
> 'A German in time of war does not ask if the war is right or wrong; he has to fight and die with his fellow-Germans.'

He admitted also that he had no political objections against Nazism, and he made it quite clear that he still rejects democracy and still believes in an authoritarian regime for Germany. Furthermore, he said that up to his liberation he had not heard anything about all the Nazi terror, nor had his wife known anything about it (*News Chronicle* and other papers, June 6, 1945, and later).

There were courageous pastors in Germany who fought Nazism as such (Liberals, Socialists, Pacifists and a few 'Confessional' outsiders, among the latter Pastor Schneider of Diekensfeld, who was murdered in a concentration camp because he refused to give the Nazi salute). But these active anti-Nazi pastors and their friends were scattered over the whole of Germany, of course without organization (except underground), and not seldom soon slain or tortured to death in concentration camps, unless they were lucky enough to escape out of Germany. The Lutherans in Norway and Denmark resisted better against Nazism, but to them Nazism was enemy invasion and it was patriotism to fight it, whilst in Germany it was patriotic to be a Nazi. Furthermore, the Scandinavian countries have had the splendid influence of their Peoples' High Schools, and that seems to have largely outbalanced that type of Lutheranism which exists in Germany and which has also existed in the Scandinavian countries, as Kierkegaard's struggle against it proves.

It is of little use only to eradicate Hitlerism in Germany, for Hitlerism is only the final outcome of German nationalism and militarism. And as Frederick II and Bismarck were Hitler's political predecessors, so Luther laid the spiritual foundation on which Nazism could be built. Unless that is realized, the real discussion about establishing a better and peaceful Germany has not started. Thus not *re*-education or *re*-construction is needed for Germany, but complete *new*-education and *new*-construction. It will therefore not do to give the power in the German Churches to the 'Confessionals,' who seem to be already assuming it by rather totalitarian methods. They will only restore that type of

actionary and nationalist churchianity which was one of the bud lls of Nazism. With regard to the question whom to trust with e Christian new-education and new-construction in Germany, ere should be very careful discrimination as to the attitude of ch individual pastor and congregation to Nazism. As everything se is being decentralized in Germany, so should be the Churches. hey should be disestablished; all administrative, legislative, displinary and judicial functions should be left to the individual; ngregation membership should be membership of an individual ngregation and a matter of application. The idea of the *Volksrche* (People's Church), to which everybody belongs so long as has not formally resigned, must be relinquished, because it is ased on the false assertion that the Church of Christ (or the eople of God) is identical with institutional churchianity. If distablishment results in the German Churches becoming poor, the etter for them; it will only bring them nearer to Christ. If the nurches cease to be powerful public bodies, that is only right, for hrist rejected such kind of power (*Matt* iv, 8-10). If the hurches lose masses of those whom they believed to be members, well, it is the little flock of true followers of Christ that is romised the Kingdom.

But the main thing is the need for a complete new-orientation nong the Christian people in Germany—and in the whole world. lready a hundred years ago Kierkegaard in Denmark demanded ot less than to get rid of 1,800 years of churchianity and to go ack to the simple truths of Christ's life and teaching. The Blumardts did the same in Germany; Prof. Heering does it from olland; Prof. Ragaz does it from Switzerland with his books on *he Kingdom of God* and *Following Christ*. In this country it is ow Dr. Major who has pointed out the great need for basic hristianity as the religion for the whole world. We have had nurchianity with all its dogmas and institutions for many centries. It is high time that we went back to the gospel of the Kingom of God as proclaimed by Jesus, with its primary demand for ove, Freedom and Righteousness.

MAN'S QUEST AND GOD'S RESPONSE

SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR RELIGION

By T. Wigley, M.A. (Cantab),
author of *A New Highway towards Christian Reality, The Necessity of Christian Modernism, Christianity and the Modern Need,* etc.

I DO not know how it happened, but a few years ago I was talking with a little girl of nine, and suddenly she was asking these questions, 'Why am I I? Why are you you? What does it mean to be I and you?' I must admit that I felt a little bewildered not only by the questions, but by the rapidity with which they shot out from the girl's mouth. In a rather cowardly way, but really to gain time for thought, I suggested that we might put the questions to her mother. She, however, was not willing to be led to the verbal slaughter in so easy a way, and told us both that such questions were not within her province, adding that surely they were within mine after years of studying philosophy. There is a directness about the feminine mind which, if sometimes stimulating, can be disconcerting. But I had gained a few precious minutes in which to arrange my thoughts into something like order. I began with a reminder that in the case of simple unicellular forms of life a splitting-up process takes place, the one cell becomes two, and thereafter they pursue an independent life. We agreed that it was very doubtful whether they could call themselves I and you, that they were not individuals, but rather dividuals. So we scrambled up the biological tree, noticing as we climbed the hints in colonial forms of that differentiation which was to to prove so significant later on. We lingered among the worms. In many groups there is what is called a metameric arrangement of the body in segments; the animal is a sort of linear colony with each segment containing its own section of each of the principal functional systems, so we didn't find much of the individual there. The Annelidian earthworm, however, gave us hope that we were on the track of what we sought, for it can't bud off a daughter segment. I think it was J. Arthur Thomson who once remarked that it was a great day in the history of evolution when the worm developed a head, there was now the possibility of distinguishing between left and right. Whether in its world of limited dimensions it could ever learn to distinguish between forward and backward is more doubtful; that is a distinction which not all humans have yet learned to make even in a world of three dimensions.

Individual Being-for-Self.

Now this talk with a child in a garden raised issues which the ıild could not understand, but which are of paramount importıce theoretically and practically to the modern world. They are, · should be, the concern of statesmen, of educationalists, of ırents, and of every citizen. Biologically regarded, life as a ovement seems to set towards ever higher individuation, with the rogress of mind the individual gains more and more meaning and gnificance. The word itself suggests inherent wholeness, someıing which cannot be cut or divided. Physically, of course, there no such thing, the atom (something which cannot be divided) enies its name. Even when we come to man, one authority tells us ıat there is much that makes us question whether man even yet is ot more rightly regarded as one in process of attaining individualy, however the term be defined, than as already an individual. t is, I think, the legitimate test to which any civilization, culture, r community, can be brought, *viz.* whether it encourages or deresses individuality. Admittedly, an individual is a person when ı social relationship, and his personality grows in proportion as ıese social relationships extend and deepen. But we should note arefully the fact that this personal and social relationship is posible only on the assumption that there is something to grow in its wn kind, which is individuality, and on this depends not only hat we can receive, but what we can contribute of ourselves to thers. Hence, any social order or social tradition, any system of ıought or organization, which prevents or hinders the expression f this essential being-for-self is to be condemned, whatever the ivine or human sanctions to which it may appeal, since it reduces ıe individual to the level of a statistical unit. What is permissible ı the realm of physics and in terms of energy is wholly out of lace in the realm of human individuals; regularity of size, even ı the counting of heads, does not necessarily connote uniformity f value, and even in the mass one has not identical intrinsic proerties with another, and if such a world were imaginable, it would e a world devoid of meaning in spiritual regard.

The Evolutionary Process.

We shall attain little understanding of man, his quest and disovery, unless we see him as a part of a process in whose universal, inked stages the inorganic and the organic find their place. While ıe dullest clod shares in these, the question is whether man shares ı more, whether indeed the whole universe is adequately decribed, let alone explained, in such terms. As every educated

person knows, the doctrine of evolution is statement of fact, in spite of the continued obscurity which lingers round some of the factors involved in it; and it should always be kept in mind that every form of scientific statement depends as much upon the scientific method which is used as upon the structure or nature of the object of its enquiry; we can never in the sciences or in religion escape from what we may call the structure of our own minds; we cannot shed, even in mathematics, our anthropormorphic mental skins. While on the physical side we seem to be concerned with events in a process manifested in terms of infinite energy, matter itself is seen to be neither dull, inert, or irrational. From what I would claim to be the broadly progressive character of the process, so far as our experience goes, we get the impression of the universe as a going-concern moving in a definite direction. As successive forms emerge they are on the whole characterized by a growing measure of control over themselves and over their environment with which they are in active and ever wider relationships. The process has certainly made for more abundant life; to developing complexity has been added integration of structure, to more intimate commerce with environment an increasing independence of it in personal regard, with a growing self-determination and power to choose, to modify and to control present and future in the light of past experience. I would stress the fact of integration, which is individuality and being-for-self, developing in the relationships between itself and its stimulating surroundings of every type. No wonder Sir Charles Sherrington, the most distinguished British physiologist, in his Gifford Lectures, *Man on his Nature*, in the midst of a discussion of reflex action feels compelled to ask fundamental questions. He finds in the motor act as conative the earliest nurse of infant mind, not the germ of mind, nor the parent of it:

> 'Let us seek where we can first trace mind, or where we last lose it. Does it not begin with urge to live? Zest to live which is part and parcel of life? Is it not that all through? Becoming gradually more sophisticated? The zest of the living thing to go on living, and renew itself as a new life. The zest which implements the whole conduct of life, the zest which the whole conduct of life implements. At once an urge, a motive and a drive. No species of life without it. Inate, inalienable, impelling alike man and animalcule. A character which in the more than millionfold variety of nature's types does not fail or falter in a single one. Individual minds of endless variety of type, reptile, fish, bee, octopus, ant . . . In them all, whatever else, this constant trait; the drive to live and increase. We can call it zest, and zest it often is, but who shall say where, traced along life's scale of forms receding from man's own, zest becomes blind drive, and drive retreats into mindless urge. It may be mind still, although mind "over the horizon," for all description "teasing us out of thought'" (p. 193).

It is not, I suggest, crudely anthropomorphic to surmise that

nature we are part of a creative activity slowly working out in utuality and co-operation a great idea dimly perceived by us. Jo one can doubt that in some way we do associate mind with this finite energy, since even the physical basis of the universe is of a athematical character in definite quantities, proportions and relaonships; here at least is intelligibility. Except in nature which ıcludes man we shall look in vain for any understanding either f man or of nature's strivings, and since it is difficult to hold inlligent conversation with amoeba or worm or other distant relaons we shall most likely find the implications of man's quest and iscovery in man himself, for ever lured beyond his horizons and ased into thought by the so far unattained.

Man and Nature.

In the light of man's past we cannot, however, allow any sharp istinction between man and nature which has all too often charcterized the approach of theologians. Only from what has been an we conceive any idea of what man is and may become. In every espect from body to mind, from reflex actions to moral ideas and eligious interpretations, we are never out of the realm of natural istory, and our religious thinking will be more sane as it keeps is fact in mind, for, as E. W. Barnes says in his *Scientific Theory nd Religion*:

> 'Any scheme of theology must, to be adequate, take account of the way in which God has fashioned and controls the Universe and must therefore be permeated by the new knowledge. Moreover, no adequate theology can be limited to human spiritual experience. Man is the outcome of Nature's processes. He is a product of the general scheme of the Universe. No one of his faculties is entirely independent of his ancestry and environment. Without exaggeration we can assert that man's spiritual experience is as unreal as a dream unless the God to Whom it leads him is also the God Whose nature is shewn in the Universe as a whole' (p. 5).

It will be obvious that along this way we shall not escape what arlyle called 'the thorny pilgrimage of understanding,' and many ere be who prefer the macadamised way of Authority, ecclesiasal and dogmatic, and find rest for their minds in a 'faith once r all delivered,' the date of such *ab extra* deliverance differs cording to the Authorities accepted by the believers. The odernist is fully prepared to admit the difficulty of forming any ear idea of the relation of Mind to the reality in which man is set, ıt he takes comfort from the acknowledged difficulty of explaing the exact relation of his own mind to the muscles which enable m to lift a cup of tea. At least we can say that in some way man some degree must be regarded as representing a part or aspect

of the truth concerning the whole, just because man is a genetic product of the process, and within his limits may well mirror in his mind its essential nature. We can never separate organism from environment, and man is no exception to this rule; from this reciprocal relationship the light must shine, unless we are to conclude that all is darkness. We shall, I think, appreciate Marshal Smuts' judgment that the universe points to something beyond itself; it has a trend, an immanent telos, and belongs to or is making for some greater whole (*Holism and Evolution*, p. 179).

No longer in mechanism but in organism are we beginning to find the clue which promises to lead to fuller and truer understanding of past, present, and future. As A. N. Whitehead well says:

> 'The universe thus disclosed is through and through interdependent . . . The biological ends pass into ideals of standards, and the formation of standards affects the biological facts. The individual is formative of the society, the society is formative of the individual. Particular evils infect the whole world, particular goods point the way of escape' (*Religion in the Making*, p. 87).

Here we have statement of fact, and, as individual development from infancy to maturity proves, growing-up simply means bringing increasing areas of ourselves into more perfect relationship with increasing areas of our environment. In a word, it is a process, to use Professor H. A. Overstreet's excellent phrase, of becoming 'more widely functioning wholes' from the use of tools to that of ideas. The process of integration goes on, and with it greater control and understanding of all that we term reality. It is significant that the genius in any realm is to be measured by the number of worlds in which he can move with ease and effectiveness, holding them all in the unity of himself. Man has been most successful in his quest and discovery in so far as he has in thought and life dealt more adequately with an increasing number of factors in any given situation. In the evolution of law and the idea of justice, for example, the tooth-for-a-tooth attitude is obviously less adequate than that which obtains in a British court of justice. In the evolution of the relationship of the sexes, the cave-man — not yet extinct — who regarded woman as chattel or domesticated animal, obviously limited not only her but himself within a very narrow range of experience which set definite limits to the development of more adequate forms of sexual experience.* There is no need to illustrate further, but we can most truly say that whether we are considering the State, Art, Education, Religion, Morals, scientific method and poetic form, discovery is ours and progress is to be estimated only in terms of wider functioning.

* *Cf.* Havelock Ellis: *Studies in the Psychology of Sex.*

Was it not Lloyd George who once said that the only difference between a rut and a grave is that the rut is shallower? Shallow or deep the rut spells extinction, a lack of adaptability which ends in certain death, or at least arrested development. For our warning we should note nature's dead ends; extinction is as much a fact as survival in the story of evolution, and I can see no reason why we should make an exception in the case of man when he refuses to develop his capacities. At his best he is more revealing of what nature is than an atom, plant or animal. McDougall, for instance, does not hesitate to affirm that in man the stream of purposive activity rises to the level of spiritual activity, that indeed the purposive and the logical nature of man's activity alike mark him as a vehicle or channel through which a spiritual realm finds partial expression:

> 'Every great poet implies that, when we are under the spell of beauty, especially of great art, we are in effective contact with a spiritual realm, however dimly it may be revealed to us in such experiences. I believe,' says McDougall, 'that the most sober psychological consideration of the facts must lead us to the conclusion that the poets are right' (*Religion and the Sciences of Life*, pp. 1-16).

Well, they may be, but I doubt whether psychological considerations alone permit us to do more than say that man's mind is continuous with an environment which thus stimulates his capacity to respond.

On the one hand we have something presented, on the other apprehended. We might use the popular word 'given,' except that it is not always appreciated by those who use it that nothing is given until it is received and accepted by one capable of such reception. All revelation is discovery as discovery is revelation, they are two aspects of the one process. Indeed, even in what some might regard as the simple question of the relation between organism and environment, it is very difficult to say exactly where environment leaves off and organism begins; perhaps we must be content to assert that they are never known apart and are inseparable.

A Realm of Ends?

Since Man is Nature at the human level, what is the meaning of the undoubted fact that man in his quest of being-for-self rises above space and time and discovers the larger than himself to which he is akin and in creative relationship with which he becomes a larger self, a more widely functioning whole? Never is there merging of mind with mind or mind with object, it is co-operation which maintains essential selfhood; the structure of the self grows in complexity of relationship, but always its life depends on the

central nucleus we call the individual, and as complexity increases the more integrated, coherent and consistent does the individual become. As a matter of experience man is not a creature of mechanical routine, he grows in so far as he expresses himself in creative life, and from being a creature of sensation he passes into the larger worlds of perception, cognition, conation and appreciation, from 'things' to find himself in a world of intersubjective intercourse which at its best is timeless. You remember Sir James Jeans's observation in *The Universe Around Us* (p. 319):

> 'Phenomena come to us disguised in their framework of time and space; they are messages in cipher of which we shall not understand the ultimate significance until we have discovered how to decode them out of their space-time wrappings.'

If that is true of phenomena, how much more true is it of personal relationships, in which time and space are most surely known to be what they are, *viz.* derived concepts. It would, I suggest, be unreasonable to believe that man in his varied and enlarging experiences of what for convenience he calls the good, the true, and the beautiful, is the uncharacteristic by-product of a universe which is indifferent to him in such relationships of worth. These have existence and meaning only for minds and in relation to ends. From this point of view we may well ask whether, if we use the word 'God' at all, can we mean anything more than a shorthand description of the kind of world which appears to us as a whole? If reality is relatedness, then what gives it this quality? Can it be that there is One as well as the many Who, not exhausted in the reality we know and therefore transcendent, is the ground of its being and immanently related to the process? We have no need to be afraid of the word 'relativity,' since relativity is universal for things, events, and values, which are part of a general structure dependent on what we may call its Source, Ground, or Determinant. If with D. C. Macintosh of Yale we define a value as 'a quality which anything has by virtue of its relation to an end-directed process, that is, a process regarded as working toward an end, whether the end be consciously contemplated in the process or not,' it will be obvious that the realm of ends becomes man's most significant world.

No man can escape this realm, even though his ends be material interests; it is pre-eminently the realm in which man as religious has developed from the earliest times, when his religious attitude was dominated by the idea of religion as a quasi-magical means of promoting his most material satisfactions — an attitude which many have not yet outgrown — to the great day when a religious genius asked, 'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do

stly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?' At ery stage we have to beware of the people who, baptizing their ejudices with the name of principles, declare of them, 'Thus ith the Lord'; what evils and errors have been promulgated in at name! The test suggested by this prophet is, you will have ticed, the crucial one for all values, that of actability, doing, ving, walking in a certain way; there is nothing abstract here, ligion is not only a way of thought but a way of life, and I would ntend that historically man has grown religiously in so far as he s ceased to expect direct intervention by God in the external rld, and been able to discover His nature and purpose in his n world of inner adjustment and integration as a personal being; re the spiritual is discovered and augmented as nowhere else. hitehead's principle of concretion with its consequent order of ture is capable of wide extension, for it involves that creative -ordination which is the characteristic of every normal forward-oking individual.

It is, I think, legitimate and reasonable to believe that a preme personality, such as we must assume God to be, will be arked by the same creative harmonious integration which dimly own in ourselves is in Him completely achieved. It is interest-g to find that C. A. Richardson in his books *Happiness, Free-m, and God* and *Strategy of Living* writing from the point of ew of what we may call a modified pluralism, in which he urges at real progress is to be measured by the attainment of the preme value of perfect happiness, concludes:

> 'Although it is an empirical fact that certain modes of behaviour tend to produce an increase in happiness, it is difficult to see how there could be any guarantee that reality is of such a nature that, potentially, happiness can increase indefinitely towards the goal of perfection unless there exists a being in the nature of an all-powerful and beneficent God.'

n the whole question of the relationship between theology and nics, as well as on the relations between the departments of owledge, I commend to your consideration F. R. Tennant's *hilosophy of the Sciences*. Within its compass I know of no more luable contribution to this all-important subject, which is often glected even by theologians and neglected entirely by ordinary ople. Tennant is rightly emphatic that

> 'Even if ethical principles and ideals were absolute, or independent of all cognition and human interests, we should need to be assured that the universe respects our ideals and aspirations before we could argue from their present forthcomingness to their perpetuation and fulfilment. The value of goodness is one thing and the permanent existence of the good is another . . . . Unless theism, or something like it, be first established, we have no reason to believe that ethical ideals, such as the highest good, are destined to be realised' (p. 182).

Whether the world is rational teleologically can only be ascertained by study of the world, and Tennant reminds us that Kant was shrewd enough to see this, for Kant did not profess to provide a moral proof of theism, but simply argued that the idea of God is a postulate for the practical reason as well as a regulative idea for the theoretical reason. In a word, *if* the moral order is to stand and what ought to be is to be, then God must exist. Please notice the word 'if,' it is important, and those who ignore it, while arguing that the permanent standing of a moral order can be deduced from the deliverances of the moral consciousness, are simply confusing the realm of the valid with the realm of the existent. There is all the difference in the world between the convincedness or certitude which declares, 'I am certain that . . .' and the certainty of an objectiveness independent of the individual which enables us to say, 'It is certain that . . . .'

Gone are the days of the eighteenth century classical mechanism with their deistic idea of God determining the laws of world events, building up His giant machine at some point in time. Well might Goethe ask, 'What sort of a God were He, who only worked from outside?' And theologians feeling the difficulty said that God could be seen at work in the creations of dead matter, of life, of mind, of each human being, in various miracles recorded in history, and especially in the scheme of salvation beginning in the Garden of Eden and ending on Calvary. I suppose this view is still regarded as orthodoxy in the great majority of Churches; it may truly be described as multiple deism, since according to it God creates in single definite acts at quite definite times. It should, however, be known by all, and acknowledged by Church leaders, that it is now impossible to hold such a view in the light of the new knowledge, whatever creedal formulations or hymns may say; and if our children are to be religious at all, another and truer theology will have to be worked out and openly proclaimed and accepted, whoever may be offended. The childish and wantonly ignorant adult must no longer be allowed to be the main obstacle in the way of the advancing feet of to-day and to-morrow. There is all the difference in the world between the childish and the childlike; the adult who is childish is infantile and arrested in his growth, the adult who is childlike has maintained the eager, experimental mind of the child, which normally is as discriminating as it is receptive.

Essentials of a Modern Theology.

The lines which such a modern theology must take are becoming more and more clear. The first essential is for one and all to recognize, in the words of Pringle-Pattison, that 'the progressive

onalization of the world by science is a continuous extension our knowledge of God,' and I would include in that word ience ' all the sciences whatever their subject-matter. It is only erience as a whole for a mind as a whole which enables us to over truth about the world and about ourselves; the way of traction will never lead us to ultimate reality. Those who would l God in the gaps of their knowledge are not merely engaged a fruitless quest, they are the victims of their own illusions, and ar as they are concerned Julian Huxley's caustic criticism in book *Religion Without Revelation* is deserved and valid. We not then limit the working of God to acts performed from with- which, it is alleged, are an intrusion into an otherwise orderly ld. Either the process is a whole, whose nature we gradually over at revealing levels of reality which invite our further ex- ration and response, or man's experience of sensory data, ideas ideals is meaningless. If we have to do with a process cosmic not chaotic, then in its entirety it has its being in God. Creation s becomes conservation, for in Him all things are, actually and ntially. It is a physicist and philosopher, Bernhard Bavink, tells us that

> for present-day physics, the contingency of being is distributed quite evenly over the whole course of the world. From this point of view, it is therefore meaningless to regard only an initial state as settled by God, and the whole remaining course as that of a clock running down. God's working upon the world must not be regarded from the human standpoint of time. According to the theory of relativity, time, like space, literally is just as much part of the world as a magnetic field is part of a magnet. Where there is no matter there is also no space and no time, and there is no obstacle to our regarding time in the non-euclidian sense, for example, as finite and returning upon itself, and in other ways also. It is obvious that on this basis such questions as the famous one, as to what God did before He created the world are completely nonsensical.'

re will be more health in theological circles when the above- bright-blue-sky idea of God is banished for ever; it should be swept from our nursery and school walls, in other words, children's minds. We have to do with a pervasive and deeply rfusing spirit, not with an absentee deity, and it is indeed tragic Christian churches should have encouraged such a trans- lent idea of God that only from a remote heaven could He occa- ally invade the world. Psalm cxxxix taught us better than that, y nothing of those other words from our New Testament writ- , ' In Him we are builded together into a holy temple for a tation of God through the spirit, ' God is spirit, and all true hip must be real and spiritual.' It may not be easy for some iscard their ancient verbal clothes, but we cannot too often nd ourselves that our symbols do affect our thought, and may

help or hinder; at the least they should be as true and adequate as we can make them, and the picture of an undivine world here below and a far-away God beyond the seven circles, who cannot effect His purposes for this lower world except by so-called miraculous interposition and by interruption of its order, is a picture not only inadequate but untrue to the facts as we know them. The so-called 'crisis theology,' associated with the name of Barth, hardly merits examination, for Barth himself says:

> 'The gospel comes to tell us that He is "wholly other" than man, so that there is no analogy between God's being and man's. The gospel proclaims a God utterly distinct from man . . . . The power of God can be detected neither in the world of Nature nor in the souls of men.'

We may well ask how any revelation is possible between beings with no spiritual unity and who are essentially unlike. There will be no place for the up-there and down-here theology when our children begin to sing:

> 'Twinkle, twinkle, little star,
> I need not wonder what you are;
> For seen by spectroscopic ken
> You're helium and hydrogen.'

The trouble is that when our imagery is seen to be absurd, what it trys to embody is too often rejected with it. This, I think, is the state of mind of tens of thousands who were once connected with our churches, and are now apparently happy to remain outside them. The ape, the tiger, and the donkey may lie behind us as we trace our pedigree backwards, and they have an unpleasant way of thrusting their ugly faces into the present, but the prime question is, what lies before us, to what are we stretching out? Explain it how we will, no one can deny that there is passion within us, an idealism, an urge to discovery, the finding of ourselves in more widely functioning and diversified wholes. Is not this a demonstration of the spirit which seeks in us to make a more perfect whole than any we have so far known? Can we indeed find a better name for this quickening vitality than the name God, beyond our perfect comprehension, but within our partial apprehension, as we seek, echoing Plato's words, as far as is possible to be everlasting and immortal? 'It doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we shall be like him, sons of God, co-workers with the Father'; the imagery is simple and profound, but these words from an ancient writing do at least set before us the task to which we must set our hearts and minds, the unending quest of self-realization in which we find ourselves as we give ourselves away. This is the way of discovery into the light of an ever-increasing and revealing day.

ILLIAM LLOYD: PROPHET AND BISHOP

(1627—1717)

By A. T. Hart, M.A., B.D., Vicar of Bordesley Green.

N the primitive Christian Church, when the Christian prophets were getting very much out of hand, the newly evolved monhical bishops claimed in the interests of episcopal authority and ler that they also were prophets. We do not find, however, that except for the purpose of suppressing the order of Christian ophets — the bishops made much use of their prophetical funcns. In the history of the Christian Church it is from the priestod rather than from the episcopate that prophets have arisen. ere was, however, a notable exception in the case of William oyd — successively Bishop of St. Asaph (1680), Lichfield and ventry (1692), and Worcester (1700-1717) — who impressed his st eminent contemporaries with his gift of vividly foretelling e shape of things to come.

Lloyd's prophecy, for example, concerning the return of the udois to Piedmont is confirmed by Edmund Calamy in his *Hisical Account of My Own Life*:

> 'He [Lloyd] had also taken much pains in studying the prophecy of *Daniel* and the *Revelation of St. John*, and had a very prophetic genius, and was peculiarly nice in his calculations of the sacred periods and as to the particular seasons, when predictions about futurities had been or were to be accomplished. He had very particularly and distinctly foretold the return of the Vaudois of Piedmont (those venerable remains of the primitive Christians) into their own country, after they had been for some time excluded from thence, soon after the Revolution compassed by King William.'[1]

lbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, discussing the Peace of rlowitz in 1698, remarked:

> 'Dr. Lloyd, the present most learned Bishop of Worcester, who has now for above twenty years been studying the *Revelation* with an amazing diligence and exactness, had, long before this year, said the peace between the Turks and the Papal Christians was certain to be made in 1698.'[2]

nfortunately, encouraged by these successes and those of his end, 'Mr. Partridge, the astrologer,' who predicted that 1688 uld be a fatal year for James II, Lloyd became more ambitious d sweeping in his prophecies. He told two young men of the udois, a minister and a schoolmaster, that if they lived until 16,

> 'they might hope to be in a manner able, standing on the top of their mountains, and lifting up their hands, to warm themselves with the

[1] Edmund Calamy, *An Historical Account of My Own Life*, Vol. II, . 382-3. [2] Burnet, *History of My Own Time*, Vol. II, pp. 204-5.

flames of the City of Rome, which would then be consumed to ashes.'[3]

As a violent anti-papist and a staunch Whig, he endeavoured to stop the peace with France in Anne's reign by coming to Court and solemnly warning the Government that it had been revealed to him,

> 'their scheme would not hold . . . and there would be no preventing a new war, which would certainly break out, ere long, and have very affecting consequences.'

The most celebrated of all his prophecies, however, was delivered before the Queen herself in 1712. He had already told her that the Church of Rome would be destroyed and the Papal City consumed by fire in less than four years time; and, provided her Majesty would hear him out, he could prove it beyond the possibility of doubt. Accordingly Anne appointed the following morning for this mighty revelation; when, armed with a great Bible and accompanied by the Bishop of London, Lloyd confronted the Queen, the Duke of Shrewsbury, Lord Oxford, Lord Dartmouth and Dr. Arbuthnot.

> 'He showed,' wrote Dartmouth, 'a vast memory and command of the Scriptures at that age (for he was then above eighty years old), but Harley, Earl of Oxford, offering to give another interpretation to one of his texts than he did, though in extreme civil terms, the bishop turned to the queen in the greatest passion I ever saw any man, and told her "So says your treasurer; but God says otherwise, whether he like it or no." The queen, seeing him so angry and rude, called for her dinner, after which he said that if what he had advanced was not true he did not know any truth, and was a very unfit person to be trusted with explaining the Gospel to other people, and desired that the queen would dispose of his bishopric to some man of greater ability, if what he said did not prove true; and then spoke something to the queen in a very low voice, that nobody else might hear; which she told me afterwards was, that after four years were expired, Christ would reign personally upon earth for a thousand years.'[1]

Swift, recounting the scene in one of his letters, commented sarcastically,

> 'Lord Treasurer Harley confounded him sadly in his own hearing, which made the old fool very quarrelsome. He is near 90 years old.'[5]

William Shippen, who evidently agreed with John Calvin that '*Revelation*, if read without caution, will either find a man mad, or make him so,' had previously made fun of Lloyd's prophetic utterances in 1704, alluding to him under the title of 'Old Mysterio.'

> 'Then Old Mysterio shook his silver hairs
> Loaded with learning, prophecy and years,
> Whom factious zeal to fierce, unchristian strife
> Had hurried in the last extreme of Life.

[3] Edmund Calamy, *An Historical Account of My Own Life*, Vol. II, p. 384.
[1] Burnet, *History of My Own Time*, Vol. I, Dartmouth's Note, pp. 337-8.
[5] Cole MSS.

Strange dotage thus to sacrifice his ease,
When Nature whispers men to crown their days,
With sweet retirement, and religious peace.
Foreknowledge struggled in his heaving breast,
E'er he in these dark terms his fear exprest:
The stars rowl adverse, and malignant shine;
Some dire portent, some comet I divine.
I plainly in the Revelations find
That Anna to the Beast will be inclined;
Howe'er, though she, and all her senate frown,
I'll wage eternal war with Packington,
And venture life and fame to pull him down.'[6]

The reference to Packington is to an M.P., a strong Tory in the Bishop's diocese, whose defeat he tried to secure unsuccessfully in a hotly contested election. His attack on Packington led in the end to Lloyd being deprived of the post of Lord Almoner.

A Latitudinarian of the most advanced school,[7] Lloyd had always been a formidable enemy of popery and high toryism, while the stout champion of an alliance between Anglicanism and Nonconformity. When still a deacon he was presented in 1654 to the Rectory of Bradfield, Berkshire, by the supposed patron Elias Ashmole, and completely satisfied the requirements of the Commonwealth committee of 'triers.' The author of an unpublished MS. Life of Bishop Lloyd thus describes the incident:

'Upon the rejection of Dr. Pordage by the Presbyterian committee, Mr. Lloyd was presented in December, 1654, to the rectory of Bradfield in the same county, by Elias Ashmole Esqr. patron of that living in right of his wife. Accordingly he was examined by the tryers of those times, and passed with approbation; but designs being laid against him by two ministers of Reading, who wanted to bring in one Dr. Temple, and pretended that Sir Humphrey Forster had the right of presentation he thought it better to resign his presentation to Mr. Ashmole rather than to undergo a contest with these busy men.'[8]

Twenty-four years afterwards this 'collaborator' with Presbyterians played a by no means inconspicuous rôle in helping Oates and his friends to inflame Londoners against the supposed authors of the Popish Plot. That was on the occasion of the burial of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, when as Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, Lloyd was asked to give the funeral oration. The corpse of the murdered magistrate, after lying in state for two whole days at Old Bridewell, was carried to St. Martin's on October 31st, 1678, seventy-two clergymen walking in front and a vast concourse of eminent laymen pressing behind. The church, which could comfortably seat about four hundred,[9] became packed to

[6] William Shippen, *Faction Display'd*, pp. 5-6.

[7] 'Burnet, indeed, definitely refers the term "Latitudinarians" to Tillotson, Stillingfleet, Patrick and Lloyd.' See W. F. Mitchell, *English Pulpit Oratory*, p. 277.

[8] Lloyd MSS, *MS. Life of Bishop Lloyd*, p. 2.

[9] K. A. Esdaile, *S. Martin-in-the-Fields*, p. 87.

suffocation, and the crowning episode of the drama arrived when Lloyd mounted the pulpit accompanied by two hefty divines, whose function it apparently was to guard his life from the assault which everyone fully expected would be made upon it, and thundered forth his text: 'Died Abner as a fool dieth?' 'A most portentous spectacle,' exclaimed North. 'Three parsons in one pulpit! Enough of itself on a less occasion to excite terror in the audience.'[10]

Lloyd may or may not have been courageous in the pulpit of St. Martin-in-the-Fields; but a situation occurred no great time later in which the real courage of the man was undoubtedly manifested. He became one of the most outstanding of the seven Bishops who petitioned James II against the reading of the Declaration of Indulgence and were committed to the Tower by an enraged King. His hand presented the petition, and his was one of the few voices that ventured to remonstrate with James on these arbitrary proceedings. Lloyd did not have to wait long for his reward. As soon as the Bishops were allowed to leave the Tower on bail he found himself detained in Palace Yard by a crowd of admirers 'who struggled to touch his hands and to kiss the skirts of his robe, till Clarendon with some difficulty rescued him and conveyed him home by a by-path.'

He was active in the promotion of the Revolution, and although on the friendliest terms with Archbishop Sancroft and others of the deprived Bishops, 'did more than any other man to persuade the clergy to accept the new dynasty with a submissive though scarcely a hearty loyalty.'

Lloyd's loyalty to the Crown, indeed, had constantly warred against his Protestant instincts, until in the person of William III he found his ideal Latitudinarian monarch and was happily enabled to combine them both. William III, in Lloyd's' eyes, was the embodiment of the ideal King; and so we are scarcely surprised to learn that the Bishop became his Majesty's Lord Almoner, and was translated to the see of Lichfield and Coventry (1692), which he later exchanged for the yet more important diocese of Worcester (1700). Here he first came into conflict with Sir John Packington, one of the Members of Parliament for the County. The new Bishop as an admirer of William naturally hated the Jacobites and high Tories, whom he regarded as concealed Jacobites, and informed the King that he would do his best to bring about a change in the county members at the next election. This pledge brought down upon his head the vials of Tory wrath, and he was accused of doing 'all he could to blacken gentlemen of good fame and

[10] North, *Examen*. 202. North alone mentions the incident of the pulpit, but he has never been contradicted.

English reputation.'[11]

Lloyd seems to have failed to win the affection of his parochial clergy in any of his three dioceses; largely no doubt because, while they were mostly high-flying Tories, their Bishop was a professed Latitudinarian and openly expressed his sympathies with Non-conformity.

> 'He refused,' it is interesting to record, 'to allow the celebrated high church Tory Sacheverell to preach in his diocese or to permit the bells to be rung in his honour'; and wrote to his friend Archbishop King of Dublin in January, 1710, deploring the 'turbulent preaching and practices of an impudent man, one Dr. Sacheverell . . . now riding in triumph over the middle of England, stirring up people to address Her Majesty for a new Parliament . . . I need hardly tell your Grace who they are by whom this work is carried on . . . The heads of them are such as have been formerly in the ministry . . . This is likely to be the overturning of all . . . and surely so understood by all the Papists and Nonjurors of the Kingdom . . . they push for it with all their might.'[12]

As regards the Nonconformists, Mr. Cooke writes in his Introduction to the *Letters of a Welsh Bishop*:

> 'In his episcopal office Bishop Lloyd was gentle, earnest, unselfish, and especially courteous with non-conformists. The laws against non-conformity then in force were most severe and stringent, but in his dealings with the Dissenters in his diocese, and especially with the Quakers, he shewed the greatest possible tenderness and consideration. It was his practice to invite them to a conference and reason with them, seeking by temperate argument and kind and liberal treatment to draw them within the pale of the Church; and whenever he could do so he would exercise his authority to relieve them from the imprisonments and penalties to which they were liable.'[13]

Lloyd, however, was not always so tender with the clergy and laity of the Established Church who happened to fall under his displeasure. For if the Bishop could be said to have a zeal for righteousness, he certainly did not believe in a policy of sparing the rod in order to enforce it. Indeed, while at Lichfield he was accused of deliberate harshness, 'his conduct rather becoming a cruel inquisitor than a Christian bishop.'[14]

'It is remarkable,' says Professor Trevelyan, 'that in 1705 the Chancellor of Worcester Diocese pronounced sentence in the Bishop's Court on a Baronet for incontinency, condemning him to appear in a white sheet in the cathedral during service on a stated day. . . . Such discipline, common in Scotland, was very rare in England in Anne's reign.'[15]

[11] Cole MSS. [12] Hist. MSS. Commission, Report II, Appendix XV.
[13] For details see Lloyd MSS.; also *An Account of the Convincement exercises and travels of that ancient servant of the Lord, Richard Davies.* Published by C. Gilpin; and Matthew Henry, *Life and Death of Mr. Philip Henry.* [14] Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1690-1, p. 158.
[15] G. M. Trevelyan, *The England of Queen Anne,* p. 94.

Hot-headed William Lloyd, prophet, Protestant and Whig, made many enemies, and not unnaturally they did not spare his reputation; but his friends were equally loud in his praises. Burnet, speaking of his prodigious learning, wrote:

> 'Lloyd was a great critic both in the Greek and Latin authors, but chiefly in the Scriptures; of the words and phrases of which he carries the most perfect concordance in his memory, and has it the readiest about him, of all that ever I knew. He is an exact historian, and the most punctual in chronology of all our divines. He has read the most books and with the best judgement, and has made the most copious abstracts out of them, of any in this age; so that [Bishop] Wilkins used to say, he had the most learning in ready cash of any he ever knew.'[19]

Undoubtedly Burnet himself had reason to be grateful to Lloyd's learning, since it was mainly responsible for his own *History of the Reformation.*[17] Yet, although so great a scholar, Lloyd never neglected his pastoral work, and if he drove others hard, he did not spare his own back, being 'ever ready to do good when he saw a proper opportunity.'[18]

He was always generous to a fault. The most notable of all his gifts to charity was the foundation of two schools in Worcester, which came about in this way: The lease of a portion of the tithes of Sheriff's Lench, and the estate of White Lady, Aston, were forfeited to him upon the execution in 1708 of Thomas Symonds and John Palmer for the murder of Ann Cormel of Bradfordton and Alice Palmer of Upton Snodsbury; but he refused to touch 'what he deemed the price of blood.' Consequently, although Lloyd had a family and was by no means a rich man, he used the money to found 'Two Charity Schools, one for boys and the other for girls, to be chosen out of the parishes of the City and suburbs of Worcester.'[19]

His tolerance towards Nonconformists has already been noticed; while he also strongly supported Archbishop Tenison in his labours for the Protestant Churches abroad.

His friendships were varied but lasting, ranging from the Non-juring Sancroft and the Tory Sharp to the Latitudinarians Burnett and Tenison, and the dissenters Richard Baxter and William Penn.

[16] Burnet, *History of My Own Time,* Vol. I, p. 337.

[17] Burnet, *History of the Reformation,* Vol. I, Prefect XI.

[18] Lloyd MSS.: *Ms. Life of Bishop Lloyd,* p. 7.

[19] Lloyd MSS.: Bishop Lloyd's Charity School Minute Book (1708-1835). Other instances of the Bishop's generosity are recorded in the *Victorian History of Worcestershire,* e.g. at Hallow: 'A free school in Hallow was instituted in 1712 by the Bishop of Worcester, lord of the Manor, who granted about 20 acres to the chancellor, archdeacon and vicar for a schoolmaster to teach all the poor boys reading, writing and the principles of Christian knowledge, and a schoolmistress to teach the poor girls reading, sewing and the Catechism.' Vol. IV, p. 538.

THE RESURRECTION: HISTORY AND THEOLOGY

By A. M. Ramsey, M.A., Van Mildert Professor of Divinity in the University of Durham.

IN the June number of the *Modern Churchman* (pp. 73—83) Mr. Gardner-Smith discussed the evidence for the Resurrection, and in particular the problem of the relation between History and Theology. His article was primarily concerned with a recent work of my own, but if inevitably I break a lance with him my purpose in this paper is not merely polemical. The contrast between his treatment of the subject and my own illustrates a divergence of outlook which has become widely apparent in New Testament studies in this country. My aim is to clarify some of the questions which are involved, and if I believe the one line of treatment to be misleading I am not unaware of the difficulties connected with the other.

(1) First, the relation between facts and the interpretation of facts. Mr. Gardner-Smith is disconcerted by the claim that history cannot be written without presuppositions. He believes that first the historian must establish the facts, and then, and only then, may the theologian rightly come onto the scene to interpret them. The two stages are distinct and must not be confused.

But the matter is not really so simple. There are historians who, so far from resenting the suggestion that impartiality is impossible, regard the acceptance of its impossibility as a condition of fruitful work. Dr. Coulton writes in his *Four Score Years*:

> 'The question of impartiality, again, is often treated with a pedantry which exaggerates healthy reverence into idolatry. The exaggerated stress which is laid upon this word *impartial,* while the thing itself is in many cases notoriously impossible of attainment, is apt to confuse the real issue. It renders men more afraid of the criticism "You are biassed" than of ignoring vital points in awkward historical questions. As G. M. Trevelyan says, "Dispassionateness—*nil admirari*—may betray the most gifted historian into missing some vital truth in his subject. In Creighton's treatment of Luther all that he says is both fair and accurate, yet from Creighton alone you would not guess that Luther was a great man or the German Reformation a stirring and remarkable movement'. . . Why should not even the most scientific historian content himself with Goethe's confession of faith: "I can promise to be sincere but not to be impartial"' (*op. cit.* p. 323).

No doubt it is of impartiality in the interpretation of facts that Dr. Coulton is writing. What of the investigation of facts in them-

selves? Is it possible to examine their occurrence as facts, without at the same time examining their meaning for those who took part in them? Professor Dodd may be quoted, as one who does think that it is :

> 'Historical writing is not merely a record of occurrences as such. It is, at least implicitly, a record of the interest and meaning which they bore for those who took part in them, or were affected by them at a greater or smaller distance of space and time. The most rudimentary kind of record is the chronicle, which is the public equivalent of the private diary. But what indefatigable Pepys ever entrusted to his most private pages *every* single thing that happened, even on one day of his life? And what chronicler ever recorded *every* event of each year enumerated in his lists? Both must select; and the motive of selection is to be found in the private or public interest evoked by occurrences. But neither diary nor chronicle is history in the full sense. Historical writing differs from these not in the fulness or precision with which it records occurrences, but in the clarity with which the record brings out the meaning of events. We might indeed say that an historical "event" is an occurrence *plus* the interest and meaning which the occurrence possessed for the persons involved in it, and by which the record is determined' (*History and the Gospel*, pp. 26-27).

If in any history it is an over-simplification to say that we can separate entirely the study of occurrences and the study of their meaning, we can see the reasons which make the separation difficult in the case of the history of Jesus. The alleged facts concerning Jesus, strictly as facts, cannot be fairly investigated solely by a scrutiny of the documents and oral traditions which are their original record. It is necessary also to scrutinize the effects which the alleged facts subsequently produced in human life and thought, and to consider them as the cause of those effects. This will make necessary a study of those effects in the sphere of faith and belief, and from this study there will come part of the evidence upon which we determine the nature of the events themselves. If the faith and belief of the apostolic age is worthless and immoral nonsense, then some events of deception might have been its cause; but if our estimate of it is very different from this our judgment about the alleged causes of it will be different too. In Dr. Quick's words

> 'It is strictly impossible to give any account of the historical origins of Christianity, which is impartial in the sense of being wholly detached from any particular estimate of its truth and value' (*Doctrines of the Creed*, p. 152).

It is a false simplification to say that the historian establishes the facts and then, and only then, the theologian appears and interprets them; for with such a total dichotomy between fact and meaning the facts themselves cannot be scientifically judged.

(2) How does this apply to the event of the Resurrection? There would be wide agreement that, whether the evidence for

The empty tomb is convincing or not, a most important part of the evidence for the Resurrection is the existence of the Church soon after the Crucifixion and the conviction of the Apostles that they saw Jesus, alive after death. I quote, with full agreement, Mr. Gardner-Smith's description of this evidence :

> 'The disciples founded the Church because they believed that Jesus was alive; they believed that He was alive because they believed that they had seen Him, and they believed that they had seen Him because He had appeared to them and spoken to them, and they recognised the form and voice of their Master. Could they have been altogether mistaken? It is not a question of the historicity of this story or that, of the accuracy of one tradition or of another; it is a plain, straightforward issue. Can we imagine any conceivable circumstances surrounding an original error which could produce a conviction strong enough to account for the founding of the Church? We may not have the first hand accounts of James and John, or Peter and Andrew, but we have the results of their labours, and we can thereby measure the strength of their conviction' (*The Narratives of the Resurrection*, pp. 174-175).

I agree. The important evidence, or a very large part of it, is where this quotation puts it. But what sort of evidence is it? We have no testimony from non-disciples that Jesus appeared as alive after death. We do not know of what sort the appearances of Jesus were. We do not know what exactly it was that the apostles 'saw,' or in what sense they 'saw' it. What was the nature of their 'visions'? What was the relation between the ocular vision and the inward impact of the risen Jesus, who was normally unseen, upon their souls? Mr. Gardner-Smith allows himself no space for the treatment of these questions. But why should he? For the discussion of these questions does not carry us very far. Inevitably we cannot expect much knowledge of the mode of the appearances, because the evidence is not that of impartial historical testimony but that of the religious experience of the apostles. They were convinced that the Lord had made Himself known to *them*; and the validity of their conviction is tested by its results in the apostolic age. And in studying the validity of their conviction can we exclude some estimate of the *worth* of the results? If we believed that the religion, life and ethics of the apostolic Church was a *farrago* of retrograde superstition, then we might conclude that the conviction of the apostles, upon which it all rested, was a delusion. But if we see worth, value and coherence in the religion, life and ethics of the apostolic age then we take seriously their conviction that Jesus really manifested Himself to them, despite the absence of neutral or outside witnesses. We have no 'neutral' evidence prior to this evidence of the experience of the apostles, and our scrutiny of the facts must needs include the discussion of their meaning and value.

It is not easy therefore, with the best will in the world, to separate the tasks of the historian and the theologian, and to say 'first the one must finish his investigation, and only then can the other begin his.' There has never been a belief in the fact of the Resurrection apart from an attitude to Jesus and a belief in God. Let some words of Dr. John Baillie sum up this discussion:

> 'I have often thought that we may very simply test our understanding of the Resurrection of Christ by putting to ourselves the following question: "Do we wish that there had been at the time something more corresponding to an impartial scientific enquiry, and that there were better attestations of the Resurrection on the part of disinterested observers; or do we realise that such attestation would be quite helpless to prove anything that Christians really believe, and that only the testimony of those *within* the faith (which is precisely what we have) could here be of any avail?' (*And the Life Everlasting*, p. 148).

(3) Let us pass on to consider the question of history and theology in connection with the narratives of the Gospels. Mr. Gardner-Smith is troubled by some words in the preface to my book, *The Resurrection of Christ*:

> 'In recent years there has been no lack of treatment of the historical problems of the narratives of the Resurrection: but these problems have too often been discussed in separation from the Gospel with which the history is bound up and from the theology which made the story of Easter worth the telling.'

Of course this is not a plea that it is dangerous to study the narratives unless we do so with certain safe prejudices in our minds! It is a plea for a widening of the field of investigation. As an illustration of the need to widen the field I would quote from the review of Mr. Gardner-Smith's *The Narratives of the Resurrection* in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (Vol. XXVIII, p. 420), though this illustration was not in my mind when I wrote my preface. The reviewer pleaded we must avoid a 'too rigid narrowing of the field of investigation.'

> 'This is apparent in the first chapter, where "the evidence of St. Paul" is limited to a few verses at the beginning of I Cor. xv. To get a just view of the problem the field must be widened to include the evidence of St. Paul as to the faith of the Resurrection, and not of St. Paul only, but of St. Peter, the *Apocalypse* and the other documents of the New Testament.'

It is here that the contrast between two methods appears. The one method is to carry out a most searching investigation of the narratives as historical documents, and to leave almost no space for the questions: 'What did the faith in the Resurrection mean to the writers of the New Testament? What does this faith point to as a probable cause of its origin? What light does the nature of the faith throw upon the nature of the event that lay behind it? What aspects of the message or doctrine were the several evange-

ts seeking to teach?' The other method is to give much space to ese questions, and to insist that the treatment of them has *some* ace in the treatment of the evidence. Clearly this latter method s its dangers, and Mr. Gardner-Smith does well to warn us of em. But if we tread near to the dangers, at least we are trying to udy an important part of the field.

To come more closely to the evangelists. If we study the narratives 'in closer connection with the Gospel' it will mean that we ve a good deal of attention to their theological purpose. The angelists are not collecting evidence in order to set forward a storical case. They are using their material to set forth the ospel of God and something of its meaning. Certainly this gives e to difficulties in our use of the Gospels as historical sources, d our use of them for this purpose must be very cautious. But e presence of 'theologizing' in a narrative does not render it storically worthless. For one thing, we can test the ways in which e later evangelists edit their Marcan source, and when we do so find that their manipulation of their sources in the interests of eological exposition does not necessarily involve the distortion the main core of information which they find in the sources. For other thing, there is no trace of the events being handed down art from the apostolic message concerning their nature as acts God's salvation. The events and the interpretative message re never preached in separation from one another; and in Professor Dodd's words:

> 'The *kerygma* is primary, and it acted as a framework of the tradition which conveyed the facts. The nearer we are in the Gospels to the stuff of the *kerygma* the nearer we are to the fountain-head of the tradition' (*The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, p. 127).

here in the Gospels are we nearer to the stuff of the *kerygma* than the narratives which tell of how Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, and was buried and was raised again on the ird day according to the scriptures?

And so to the narratives of the Resurrection? Here the evangelists are reproducing, within their own didactic frameworks, traditions handed down in the Christian communities. It is worth our hile first to read the narratives with an eye upon their probable e in the early communities, and to ask what would be their message and their didactic and devotional value. Here we notice that e story in *Mark* xvi, 1-8, of the visit of the women to the tomb is ysterious and even numinous in its effect. It is a fact that this ory, ending as it does with the record of the silence and fear of the omen, conveys to many Christian readers the atmosphere of an e-inspiring event. Mr. Gardner-Smith is 'amazed' at my saying is. But the story does make this impression and may have done

so in the early Christian communities. I felt this about the story long before I read in *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels* that Professor Lightfoot thought the same.

But when we have considered what the evangelists are doing (which is not collecting evidence to convince us) and have examined their theological purposes, we can the better scrutinize the evidence which they do in fact provide. Here we must be sure 'on what principles historical criticism is to be conducted.' We have to consider the sources and what may be behind them, and the evangelists' use of the sources. Our first source is *Mark*, but the tradition he reproduces is not necessarily pure tradition. There is a good deal to be said for Dibelius' view that the words of the young man in white are a development in the tradition. *Matthew's* special sources will command less confidence. The presence in his Passion narrative of a seemingly 'Midrashic' source arouses suspicion that the episode of the guard at the tomb may come from a similar source. Further, the probability that Matthew used a copy of *Mark* containing nothing beyond xvi, 8, makes it probable that his concluding section was written without the help of the guide upon whom he had relied for his main story. *Luke's* sources present an important problem. As edited, they are later than *Mark*; but in themselves they may, as Streeter urged, be as early and as valuable historically as *Mark*. We have a good deal of opportunity for testing Luke's method of using his sources. He has his own ways of manipulating them. He sometimes re-writes a story so as to heighten its dramatic and psychological effect. He has his own emphasis upon the divine purpose in 'the scriptures' in relation to the Cross and the Resurrection. He is apt to be arbitrary in his chronology. But we do not find, studying his Gospel as a whole, that those tendencies lead him to alter the main facts which he finds in the Marcan source; and presumably this is true of his handling of his non-Marcan sources as well. We shall therefore need very strong reasons for regarding the peculiar Lucan Resurrection stories as unhistorical. As to *John*, we are bound to recognize the large part that is played in his writing by theological interpretation. But again, this does not render his narratives valueless as history. When he uses a tradition about the tomb, a tradition about an appearance in Galilee and a tradition about an appearance in Jerusalem, the fact that in each case he 'theologizes' does not make it 'useless to seek for history in his account.' For his own theology depends avowedly upon taking history seriously. Clearly we must use his record with great caution, but the pieces of history which he gives may be neither so few nor so fragmentary as has sometimes been insisted.

Such being the characteristics of the narratives a certain scep-

ticism seems to be inevitable : in particular a scepticism as to the possibility of reconstructing the events in detailed sequence. It is surprising that Mr. Gardner-Smith thinks that this scepticism needs much defence. We cannot harmonize with any certainty the narratives of Holy Week or the narratives of the trials of our Lord between the arrest and the crucifixion; and we do not feel surprise that this is so. In the case of the narratives of the Resurrection there are special reasons for expecting a harmony to be unlikely, quite apart from those general characteristics of the narratives which we have considered. There were appearances to different people in different places; we do not know that all the women acted together, or all the disciples, and it must have been from the first days overwhelmingly difficult for anyone to give a connected account. Further, the evangelists give us but a portion of all the traditions that existed. Further, the fact that *Mark's* narrative is mutilated robs us of much that we would like to know, just as it may have robbed *Matthew* and *Luke* of help which they would otherwise have had. But scepticism as to the possibility of a harmony is not the only scepticism to which we are led. There are particular points about which certainty is very improbable. Who appeared to the women at the tomb? A young man, or an angel, or Jesus Himself? I am inclined to agree with Mr. Gardner-Smith that 'the evangelists have woven these alternative explanations into the narratives.' And what did the young man or angel say? Here I certainly agree with Mr. Gardner-Smith.

> 'The discrepancies of the Gospels are clear evidence that, as the story was retold, appropriate words were put into the mouth of the young man or the angel or the angels . . . but little reliance can be put on any of them.'

I agree. (Mark's version of the words may itself be a development in the tradition, as Dibelius suggested.) But because I agree I am astonished, 'puzzle-struck' as we say in County Durham, that Mr. Gardner-Smith and others have built upon these words in *Mark* xvi, 7, an entirely confident and detailed reconstruction of the whole Easter Story.

The reconstruction is impressive. The priority of the Galilean tradition, the departure of the disciples to Galilee, the appearance of Jesus to them there, the visit of the women to the tomb, their encounter with a stranger and their panic-stricken flight, the inferences drawn later about an empty tomb, the transference of the traditions to Jerusalem, the progressive elaboration of the traditions about the tomb. But is this reconstruction demonstrated or even nearly demonstrated? It is built upon that point in the traditions where certainty is least probable, and the building of it requires the rejection of the historical value of the Lucan traditions.

It is far too much to say, 'The actual course of events can be reconstructed with some confidence.'

What alternatives are there? None, that can be proved. Several, that are extremely possible, and deprive the Galilean theory of an exclusive place amongst reasonable conjectures. There is Burkitt's conjecture that the disciples returned to Jerusalem after accomplishing only a small part of their journey. There is C. H. Turner's conjecture that Jesus appeared to the women and released them from their panic. There is Hodgson's suggestion that some of the disciples were in Galilee and others in Jerusalem. There is Creed's recognition that

> 'It is possible that, though from the point of view of the transmission of tradition Luke represents a secondary editing of *Mark*, he has nevertheless rightly edited *Mark* into closer conformity with historic facts' (*The Gospel according to St. Luke*, p. 316).

There is also the view of Johannes Weiss (*Urchristentum*, pp. 10, ff) that the words of the young man in *Mark* xvi, 7, represent an impure tradition and rest upon a misunderstanding of the words of Jesus recorded in *Mark* xiv, 28, 'I will *lead you forth* into Galilee.' Certainly a thoroughly critical procedure will lead us behind the present form of the Marcan tradition. Mr. Gardner-Smith does this in one way — by eliminating the word *egerthe* and yet retaining the words of the young man as they stand. Weiss does this in another way, by retaining the former and questioning the reliability of the latter. Of the two conjectures Weiss' seems to me the more reasonable. But none of these reconstructions can be proved or nearly proved; and it seems reasonable to be suspicious of one which involves us in an almost total rejection of the Lucan evidence, that there were appearances on Easter day in or near Jerusalem.

Here then is the contrast between the two conclusions. The one is to be confident of a particular reconstruction resting upon the words attributed by *Mark* to the young man at the tomb, and as a result of this confidence to be doubtful as to the discovery of the empty tomb by the women. The other is to be confident of no reconstruction that has been suggested, and yet to think there is insufficient reason to doubt that the discovery of the empty tomb belongs to the earliest traditions that we have. In both conclusions scepticism and confidence play a part, and it seems to me that it is in the former conclusion rather than the latter that the confidence goes beyond what is reasonable.

(4) What finally is the bearing of the question of the empty tomb upon the presentation of the Resurrection in the modern world? Here I believe that the important distinction is not between those who believe in the empty tomb and those who do not. There

more important issue. On the one hand it is possible to equate Resurrection of Christ with a survival of His soul in such a way t the great event of the Gospel is little more than a revelation illustration of the fact of human immortality. 'In the sight of unwise He seemed to die, but in fact His soul persists, and the rvival of Jesus is the guarantee to us of our immortality as mbers of the human race.' On the other hand, it is possible to nk of the Resurrection of Christ as the writers of the New stament thought of it, a mighty act of God who raised Him from dead, an act which is the source of a new creation into which may be drawn by making *Christ's* death and Resurrection, both e and hereafter, our own. This is the Gospel of the surrection.

It is indeed possible to believe that God raised Jesus from the ad and yet to be doubtful about the evidence of the empty tomb. hink it is important that we should recognize this. But if the act raising Him has the cosmic significance which the New Testant writers attach to it, the empty tomb is specially congruous th the Christian Gospel. What belief in the empty tomb may an for a view of the world that is both Christian and modern is en in Dr. Quick's posthumous work, *The Gospel of the New orld*.

What happened to create the religious experience, the faith, e theology and the ethics of the Apostolic age? My contention s been that it is an impossible and unscientific simplification to w the determining of what happened as one task, and the determining what it meant and is worth as another and a separate task. ne reaction against this simplification has its dangers, and a disple of the reaction can only be grateful for warnings against them. t the simplification does not serve either a properly scientific vestigation of the facts, or a true understanding of the nature of ristian belief. Our belief in the Resurrection cannot rest upon oof first, and interpretation afterwards, particularly since the st important evidence is the conviction of the apostles that Jesus d shewn Himself to them alive. Our belief in it, like theirs, is und up with belief in the God and Father of Jesus Christ. And r efforts to commend our belief, whether on the lines which I ve been criticizing or on the lines which I have tried to advocate, l under the warning once given by Dr. Hort:

> 'The effort to be impersonal affects injuriously the discussion of Christian evidences to at least this extent, that it beguiles Christians into setting forth the considerations which ought, they think, to be convincing to others, with little or no reference to what has actually exerted power over their own minds. Christian truth never appears so vulnerable as after the reading of treatises written expressly in its defence' (*The Way, the Truth, the Life*, pp. xix, xx).

THE CENTENARY OF RICHARD BARHAM*

> Let us now praise famous men . . . .
> Such as found out musical tunes and recited verses in writing.
> Ecclus. xliv, 1, 5

WE gather here to-day for a short space to remember in the City of London a famous inhabitant of the City who died a hundred years ago last Sunday. Richard Barham, although born in Kent, was educated in the City at St. Paul's, where he was Captain of the School, and was subsequently a City Rector, a Minor Canon of St. Paul's, a Priest in Ordinary of the Chapel Royal, and Chaplain to a City Company. This or a similar combination of offices is not very uncommon, and though of course none of us can have known Barham, those who have long been connected with the City can perhaps recall some priest who might justly be thought of as one of Barham's successors. For he has left behind him a record of duty conscientiously and regularly performed and of respect won from parishioners and colleagues alike.

His son has described his ministry in the language of his time and we have no reason to think that filial partiality has made the picture too favourable:

> 'As he became more generally known, but one feeling seems to have prevailed, that of affectionate esteem — a testimonial the more worthy as it was won by no assumption of manner or pliability of principle, but simply by those stable qualities of head and heart which rendered him not only most earnest, but commonly most successful in the discharge of his duties.
>
> 'In the pulpit he was not remarkable . . . It was not then as a popular preacher, "pleasant to sit under," that he was beloved. Still less as a party one; he published no pamphlets, got up no petitions, nor was his voice to be heard at Exeter Hall: but he was ever watchful over the welfare of his people, temporal and eternal; to the poorer portion of his brethren more especally did he commend himself by the kindness and assiduity with which he relieved their necessities and furthered their views; . . . Most fortunate, too, was he in the companionship of one who as a Christian clergyman's wife, fulfilled with exemplary zeal those numerous and nameless offices of charity which fall more peculiarly within the province of woman's superintendence' (Memoir 1850, affixed to Legends, 3rd Series, p. 22).

Such a record by itself does not usually win a Centenary Observance: enough in such a case if some librarian or antiquary, especially if he were himself in orders, should note that an old Cathedral and City worthy had died just a hundred years ago.

* A sermon preached at St. Martin's Church, Ludgate Hill, on June 20th, 1945, by the Rev. Canon Adam Fox, late Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford.

night often be almost a sufficient epitaph for such a one to te Dr. Johnson's rather moving lines upon his doctor:

> His virtues walk'd their narrow round
> Nor made a pause, nor left a void;
> And sure the Eternal Master found
> The single talent well employed.

But Richard Barham was not a man of a single talent: he had at least. Alongside the conscientious performance of his isterial duties went an extraordinary gift for light verse. This I think I ought to try to analyse briefly. The fundamental uirement for success in this line is resource in rhyming and icity in metre, and these two accomplishments Barham seems ave possessed by nature from an early age. But these alone ld only produce trifles. He added to them an enormous zest jokes including puns, and to this he joined a truly Gothick ion of the Middle Ages. His interest in spectres, cadavers, ches, curses, haunted chambers, secret chests, ruins, and old ends was prodigious. He was an antiquary, but one whose antic imagination had overwhelmed him. And all these tencies we find fused together to produce poems which, whether y were absurd or macabre or convivial, were at any rate quite orgettable. No one who has read, or has heard read in childod, as I did, the *Jackdaw of Rheims* or *The Execution* or *The ight and the Lady* or *The Coronation* has failed, I should supe, to remember them all his life. It would not be suitable to te any characteristic specimens of this rare artistry in the pulpit, because there is anything improper in the *Ingoldsby Legends*, because of their incongruous and somewhat bizarre comicality. t a verse-writing clergyman, we may hold, is under no obliion to confine his compositions to such as may be read in church. e are permitted to think that God allows and indeed inspires all that cheers and pleases so innocently and with so much skill. r gathering here this afternoon loses much of its point if we y not thank God for the *Ingoldsby Legends*.

But it seems to me that we can *learn* something as we remember chard Barham. The clergy may learn one lesson and the laity bther. The clergy may learn (and the laity may note) how much re is effected than appears at the time by the regular performe of those particular tasks which we take upon ourselves at our dination and whenever we are licensed. A steady adherence to ministerial and pastoral duties gives us a prestige which no herence to causes, no remarkable accomplishments, and not en pulpit eloquence can win for us. Against this background duty almost any activity looks well. The devout laity, I believe,

read the poems of John Keble and the very different poems of Richard Barham with a kind of comfortable satisfaction which is impossible in reading the poems of those two scamps Herrick and Charles Churchill, better poets, I should say, than Barham and Keble, but very negligent clerks, and even worse.

And a hundred years ago the clerical life was lived with an absence of self-consciousness which we can envy. There does not seem to be much reason to think that Mr. Barham felt that he was doing anything in particular by going into Holy Orders. He chose it as an alternative to going to the Bar, and seemingly because he liked it better and it suited him. His feelings were probably those of an old clergyman whom I heard a very few years ago telling an undergraduate at Oxford that he had always considered being in Holy Orders a charming profession, a charming profession. That sounds rather old-fashioned now. But while we have gained immeasurably by a heightened sense of vocation in entering Holy Orders, we have lost a certain freedom and ease as well.

And this brings me to my second point, and that is the clergyman's recreations. We promise, when we are priested, to lay aside the study of the world and the flesh. But after all we are mortal men, and we must relax. St. John the Divine long ago observed, when criticised for keeping a pet partridge, that the bow could not always be bent. And for the other side of the picture, coming much nearer our own time, someone has reported an impression of the celebrated Dr. Pusey as he was about eighty years ago and commented upon it in the following terms: that he was incapable, or had made himself incapable, or deliberately acted as though he was incapable, of taking any interest in anything that was not directly, technically religious, or that was not explicitly connected with religion. And that this was quite uncatholic, quite unlike the greatest of the Catholic saints, quite unlike the Jesus of the Synoptists, with all of whom God is the God of Nature as of Grace—a God deeply interested—if this be not profane—also in not directly religious things (*von Hügel*, Selected Letters, p. 254).

Indisputably some diversions are unsuitable for a man in Holy Orders, and a keen interest in money or food perhaps more reprehensible in him than in the laity as marking peculiarly a love of the world. But the laity seem to me to have become too hard on the clergy. I cannot for the life of me see any reason against clergymen going to the races or even to a respectable public-house which does not apply equally to the laity if they call themselves Christians, unless it is that the clergy are morally feebler and will more easily succumb to the temptation of gambling or drink. And this,

am sure, is not so. As to the clergy indulging in literary composition of a secular kind, there is a long tradition which permits it, if the writing is not libellous, profane, or indecent. And Barham's writings were none of these things. Nor could it be said that he allowed his sacred office to be obscured by his reputation as a writer of comic verse. None of the *Ingoldsby Legends* were published until he was in his forty-ninth year, though he had written the same sort of thing all his life as his letters sufficiently show, as they show incidentally that he could write serious verse also. All that could be said of his humour is that it was of a rather robust kind which seems now to have gone out of fashion. But it was characteristic of his age. He was born in the same year as his friend Theodore Hook, he died in the same year as his friend Sidney Smith; the editor of the periodical to which he contributed the *Ingoldsby Legends* was the young Charles Dickens.

I suppose that those who dabble in popular psychology probably look upon Barham's verse-writing as throwing a rather fierce light on his character. They will say that the Legends were a compensation or an escape, that they are his way of revolting against his clerical profession, and that his preoccupation (obsession they will probably call it) with the occult and the superstitious sides of life shows this only too clearly. Yet in fact he gives the impression of being neither pre-occupied nor obsessed, but only vastly amused by the absurd and the incongruous. He thought it no crime if cheerfulness was always breaking in. He would have been content with the old saw that 'All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy.' And so it does. I don't know if there is much psychology in the old saw; it looks like pure common-sense; but at least it must have prevented millions from being inhibited, and Richard Barham amongst them. The most you could say is that he was unconventional. And it seems to me that in the course of the last hundred years the general idea of a clergyman in his hours of relaxation has become rather too conventional, and for this I think the clergy themselves are perhaps less to blame than the lay-folk, who, as I was suggesting, are apt to be shocked at the clergy doing all sorts of things which they do themselves without the slightest qualm, indeed with the greatest good humour. And the restrictions under which the clergy now labour do seem rather to prevent them producing the real *characters* that there used to be among them, and that with something of loss to the Church.

So let us remember Richard Barham today with kindness and with gratitude, and with a notion in our heads that we have something to learn from so worthy a man, a dutiful clergyman, and in his own way a genius too.

BOOK REVIEWS

PROFESSOR A. E. TAYLOR'S LATEST APOLOGY

It was fitting that Professor A. E. Taylor, whose recent death we deplore, should in his last book have summarized the arguments he had elaborated elsewhere in defence of Christianity against the attacks of science falsely so called. For one of the main objects to which he had devoted his outstanding abilities and vast learning was that of making clear the reasonableness of an intelligent Christian's faith. In *Does God Exist?* * we have his latest thoughts on this high theme, expressed in untechnical language for the benefit of readers who are neither expert theologians nor students of philosophy.

In the course of a comprehensive survey he argues that the uniform order of the physical world and the way in which living organisms prepare themselves for meeting future needs suggest, though they cannot prove, the existence of a controlling purposive intelligence. Further, man's moral life, with its immutable distinction between right and wrong, gives grounds for believing, not simply in a supreme intelligence, but in a righteous ruler of the whole universe of being. The moral law is as much an integral part of the structure of the universe as is the law of gravitation, and the authority of conscience bears witness to the active presence of a living God.

These and allied considerations are urged with characteristic earnestness and force. A few incidental statements may be questioned, and Prof. Taylor may sometimes appear to forget that many scientists would disown the views he opposes. But few readers will dispute the cogency of his line of thought or fail to appreciate the careful sobriety of his conclusions.

It is, however, in the final chapter that his argument reaches its climax. For Prof. Taylor there goes on to maintain that it is entirely reasonable to believe such specific Christian doctrines as those of Christ's bodily Resurrection, Virgin Birth, and Second Coming. He does not attempt to vindicate the truth of these doctrines; but he tries to show that the principles of sound thinking by no means prevent us from whole-heartedly accepting them, although the historical evidence adduced in their defence is in itself inconclusive. His line of argument raises some interesting and important questions and demands respectful but impartial consideration.

Prof. Taylor begins by reminding us that we feel quite sure of the truth of many statements which we cannot prove to be true by strictly logical reasoning. Our confidence may be based on the assumed reliability of our own and other people's memories, and on the assumed veracity of our informants. We are probably quite right in making these assumptions, but we cannot pove that *A's* memory did not deceive him or that *B* was not telling a lie. Again, we firmly believe many things which we cannot ourselves prove because we unquestioningly accept the statements of experts. How many of us could prove that the earth is nearly a sphere? Finally, we interpret facts in the light of the general principles assumed to be applicable to the whole field to which the facts belong. A total eclipse of the sun meant for the ancients a portent of disaster; we think of it as an astronomical phenomenon.

These observations are both sound and important. For, as Bernard Bosanquet in particular pointed out, we do not habitually attain certainty by a chain of logical inferences, as if we were proving a problem in geometry. On the contrary, we begin with a provisional idea of the question we want to clear up. This preliminary idea or thought-pattern is shaped by our interest

**Does God Exist?* By A. E. Taylor. (Macmillan. 7/6. 1945.)

he question with its background of habitual tendencies and interests from terial provided by our knowledge and experience. We develop and amend pattern to make it include all ascertainable relevant facts and considera-ns, to the exclusion of those which are irrelevant. We are satisfied only en the pattern has grown both comprehensible and coherent. Moreover always approach a question as one in a specific field of knowledge and erience organized on appropriate general principles. These principles must de us in developing our pattern and be exemplified by the pattern in its l form. Roughly speaking, this is the way in which, for example, scientists elop and amend their theories.

Prof. Taylor would, I think, have been in general agreement with this cription of rational thinking, though no doubt he would have phrased it ter. But he seems to assume that a man would be thinking on these ional lines if he assured himself that Jesus Christ did in fact rise on the d day by arguing as follows[1]: The Resurrection was not simply an his-ical event like the battle of Waterloo. It was also a fact belonging to a lm of ultimate spiritual realities or truths. It must be admitted that the torical evidence in favour of this exceptional event having taken place uld not convince an impartial historian or scientist. But because the ritual meaning of the Resurrection makes it more than an historical event, strength of this evidence must be judged in the light of such guiding nciples as those of the power and love of God and the unique mission of us Christ. The event then ceases to be an improbable one and might have n expected. The historical evidence then gains new and decisive weight ause it provides reasonable confirmation of a probable expectation.

This line of argument is, however, clearly fallacious. For it confesses two tinct though related questions. Just because Christ's resurrection must be proached as at once an historical event and a spiritual reality, we must ask h: What actually took place in the rock-tomb and elsewhere? and What dence is there in the experience of Christians that the living Christ is ively present in them and in the world? The answer to the first question l be in factual terms—such and such events took place. The answer to the ond question will be in terms belonging to a different field of knowledge l experience. One answer, we may say, will be a factual historical thought-ttern; the other will be a value-pattern.

The two patterns, though distinct, are not unrelated. They have a common kground in the enquirer's general outlook on the world. If he is a scientific nostic he will organize them both on principles different from those which uld guide a Christian thinker. Also in so far as they both include the same ject-matter, *e.g.* the Disciples' experiences, they must support and not ntradict each other. But they will play their appropriate parts in the man's ole enquiry only if each is developed by admitting or rejecting the type of dence belonging to its particular field. To maintain that the Christian's perience of communion with the living Christ proves that Christ's body left tomb on the third day is no less illogical than to say that the fact of his dily resurrection guarantees his continued effective presence in the world.

This discussion of Prof. Taylor's line of thought very possibly exaggerates extent to which in his view the evaluation of historical evidence should be luenced by extraneous considerations. But that such influence is within its legitimate is an integral part of his argument. I can only respectfully gret that his great authority should help to perpetuate a logical confusion ich has vitiated the thinking of too many theologians, though emphatically t that of our wisest religious teachers.

H. Bompas Smith.

[1] See pp. 127, 142-150 of Prof. Taylor's book.

A MODERN CHURCHMAN AND THE OLD TESTAMENT

*The Old Testament in the Christian Church** is a scholarly, instructive and lucid little volume. It is not intended for secularists but for uninstructed Christians and particularly for practising Churchmen. It consists of five chapters and three valuable appendices. The chapters dealing with the Old Testament in Criticism, History and Science will attract most attention as valuable summaries of aspects of the Old Testament which the modern preacher finds very difficult to treat simply and positively in the presence of mixed congregations who are almost entirely ignorant of any right understanding of the theme.

Mr. Sparks stresses how unfortunate has been the impression created by the terms 'Biblical Criticism' and the 'Higher Critics' being used to describe modern Biblical studies and those who pursue them. His conclusion of the result of these critical studies is summed up as follows:

> '. . . The traditional Christian attitude towards the Old Testament stands in need of very drastic modification. The phrase "Word of God" as applied to the Old Testament can no longer mean what it did. Whatever significance we may finally attach to it, there seems no denying that that Word was first committed to man, and then handed down, through normal channels' (p. 43).

When Mr. Sparks turns to the Old Testament and History, he justly describes the Old Testament as 'the Hebrew record of the action of God in History':

> '. . . There is from the beginning to the end of the Old Testament an insistent call for obedience to the commands of the Living God, who works out through events in the world the purposes of His Will' (p. 44).
>
> 'For them (the Hebrews) History was no series of casual happenings, in which they might or might not be interested. From the Creation until their own day it was the story of what God had done. And from what He had done they could infer both what He was like and what claims He had upon them' (p. 44). (cf. e.g. *Josh.* xxiv, 1-25, and *Ps.* cxiv.)

Mr. Sparks sums up the relations of the Old Testament to History, having stated the traditional view of that relationship, as follows:

> 'The traditional point of view regards the Bible's historical accuracy as guaranteed by its Author. For Gregory the Great and his disciples the sacred writers were the "pens of the Holy Ghost." Their words were His words. Consequently, any errors which might be discovered in the Old Testament would assume the character of His errors. It was, of course, inconceivable that a Divine revelation, given in such circumstances, could be anything else but perfect; and that is why Quenstedt could so dogmatically declare "that there is in Canonical Scripture no untruth, no falsity, no error, not even in the smallest particular"' (p. 58).

Mr. Sparks sums up with courage and clearness the verdict of the modern student of the Old Testament:

> 'Yet, in matters of history, there are in the Old Testament quite a number of "untruths," "falsities," and "errors," and they are by no means confined to the smallest particulars' (p. 58).

Mr. Sparks when dealing with the relation of Anthropology to the Old Testament is particularly valuable. He writes:

> 'It will by now have become apparent that this brief sketch of Hebrew Custom, Morals, and Religion, differs radically from the traditional picture. According to that picture, the first man Adam was created in a state of perfection and enjoyed complete communion with God, his

* *The Old Testament in the Christian Church*. By H. F. D. Sparks. S.C.M. 1944. 6/-.

estrangement being due to the Fall. Thereafter, the history of mankind is a story of constantly increasing wickedness. In the Law, however, God gave to Israel through Moses explicit instructions as to His requirements, even down to the smallest detail. Yet Israel always "refused to hearken." So God raised up prophets, "rising up early and sending them." And the prophet's function was to recall his hearers to what all knew already to be the truth, although most of their practice denied it. The prophetic message, therefore, was no new message, but simply a reiteration of the old. That Jehovah was "God alone," that He demanded a certain standard of conduct, that there was one correct way to worship Him and one only, these things (according to the traditional picture) had all been previously revealed. Consequently, the prophetic appeal was always an appeal to the past, and a call to return to the purity of the wilderness period when the Law had first been given.

Anthropology, on the other hand, bids us see Man's cultural and religious history as a process, moreover, in which Israel shared. Belief in the One Only God, the post-exilic liturgical system, the conviction that ritual without ethics is valueless in the sight of God, were not arrived at in a single day. They were the fruits of centuries of growth. It is, of course, true enough that the Hebrews, especially through their prophets, made a number of remarkable and distinctive contributions to the sum total of Man's beliefs. But not for this reason can they be regarded as standing outside the general course of development. There are far too many relics of the primitive still surviving in the Old Testament as it has come down to us, not to mention the unquestioned parallels with Babylonian and Egyptian theology and ritual, for any such suggestion to be entertained. The Hebrews started where others started. Their importance lies in the fact that they achieved so very much more. The difference, therefore, between the Old Testament Religion and other religions is a difference, not in essence, but in achievement.'

We may not cite Mr. Sparks further, but very heartily commend his book, ot only to the laity but also to the clergy. Mr. Sparks is not only a scholar : e is also a most competent teacher.

H.D.A.M.

ON BEING A REAL PERSON

Readers of Dr. Fosdick's recent volume of sermons, *Living Under ension,* must have been struck by one unusual sermon of this great preacher.)r. Fosdick would not, I think, claim to be an 'original thinker' in the ense in which the words might be applied to Canon B. H. Streeter or Professor Toynbee; but he has assimilated the ideas and their basis of those who re original, especially in Theology and History, and their ideas he hands n to the man in the pew illuminated with a clarity of exposition, a wide ision, a humour and a depth of conviction which make him the great religius force he is.

The sermon referred to is 'The Parlour Picture and the Cellar Picture.' ts brilliance is sufficiently obvious when it is realized that a writer of a ifferent type would have headed the sermon 'Incipient *Schizophrenia.*' The ermon gave a hint, by its nature, that Dr. Fosdick could work his wizardry n the field of Psychology as successfully as in that of Theology.

But *On Being a real Person** did not begin with its author's assimilation f the most assured conclusions of the greatest psychologists. It began when he great preacher, desiring a more intimate personal relationship with his ongregation and 'feeling sure that one major test of a sermon is the wish f at least some hearers to talk over their individual problems in the light

* By Harry Emerson Fosdick. (S.C.M. Press. 8/6. 1944.)

of it,' announced definite hours of conference when he would be available. He found himself 'dealing with a threatened case of suicide while fourteen other people awaited their turn for interviews.'

The nature of these and subsequent cases made psychiatric knowledge imperative, and Dr. Fosdick began to work with Dr. T. W. Salmon of New York. He says he owes an incalculable debt to this pioneer psychologist. Later he co-operated with the neurologists and psychiatrists of the New York Psychiatric service. The need for competent medical advice is, of course, fully stressed.

This book is the result of twenty years' experience of giving personal counsel, and is written for clergy and teachers, who have to give advice on human problems with little or no training, and for people like 'the many diverse individuals who have come to me for help.' Dr. Fosdick adds that his motive as a personal counsellor was simply to help people,

> 'and to confront religion only when, following the trail of their problems and needs, I ran headlong into it. . . . One does run headlong into it. In . . . one problem after another the realistic wants of troubled souls lead to the confrontation of religious questions and to the need of such backing, re-orientation and resource as genuine religious faith provides.'

The book proceeds to discuss causes of personal unhappiness based on actual cases dealt with by Dr. Fosdick. He begins by stating that the human personality is not entirely conditioned. The influence of heredity and environment are fully acknowledged, but Dr. Fosdick adds

> 'Life consists not simply in what heredity and environment do to us but in what we make out of what they do to us.'

And his illustrations range from Sir Walter Raleigh to Helen Keller. This and all such assertions are not made without authority. Here, for example, Dr. S. R. Hathaway's *Physiological Psychology* is quoted:

> 'The effects of personality upon glands are more impressive and easier to illustrate than are the effects of glands upon personality.'

The person in trouble, therefore, must be made to realize his own responsibility for what he makes of himself. The salvation of the Prodigal Son began 'when he came to himself.' This realized, the person in need of counsel is advised that 'being a real person' is a matter of integration.

> 'The major criterion of success is *e pluribus unum*. The word 'crazy' itself comes from the French *écraseé*, meaning "broken" or "shattered."'

The tensions which cause disintegration, and, more familiarly, the sensation known as 'being rattled'—which may be wretched enough, as Fosdick says—are fully examined with an amazing wealth of illustration which does not exclude characters in fiction The reader is compelled to wonder what the author has not read.

The rest of the book discusses the process of integration of personality. The patient must learn to say with Noah in *The Green Pastures*, 'I ain't much but I'se all I'se got': he must learn to see himself in true perspective: he must learn how to deal with anxieties, to master depression, and finally to achieve 'wholeness.'

This is a great little book, full of a robust common sense and the fruits of research which is recorded in a twelve-page index of references. Above all, it sparkles. For example, to illustrate false props for self-esteem, Dr. Fosdick quotes a prayer used at a Genealogical Society's meeting:

> 'Justify, O Lord, if it be possible, the high esteem in which we hold ourselves.'

The careful arrangement of the book makes it the perfect basis for a course of sermons on 'causes of unhappiness.'

N. S. Power.

THE HOUSE OF THE INTERPRETER

Dr. A. J. MacDonald's book, *The Interpreter Spirit and Human Life*,* is also a study in Biblical theology, though in this case it is the doctrine of the Spirit which is the author's concern. There the resemblance ends, for Dr. MacDonald's object seems to be not to learn *anew* or *afresh*, but to support and even buttress the traditional doctrine. His secondary purpose apparently is to refute even so mild a deviation from the traditional view as that put forward by Dr. Kirk in 1929, suggesting a Binitarian tendency in the early centuries.

The first part of Dr. MacDonald's book is a careful *resumé* of the 'spirit' passages in the Old and New Testaments and Apocrypha. This is on well-trodden lines, except that in the New Testament the author makes a clean-cut distinction between those passages which in the Greek have the definite article and those which have not. The former cases denote the spirit as an agent and operating transcendentally from above or from without 'as a divine being'; the latter 'when he is described as the inward inspiration or impulse or motive of human action, and the action is attributed to the immanent influence of the Spirit as an impersonal divine power or energy within the human subject' (p. 66).

How this is worked out cannot be dealt with here, but a few quotations will show the conclusions to which the author comes on the basis of the insecure distinction cited above.

> 'The Apostolic Church was conscious of the direct operation and influence of the Holy Spirit, as distinct from Father and Son. . . . In the Epistles of St. Paul, as in the Acts of the Apostles, the Spirit's distinctive agency and personality are nearly always signified by the use of the article' (p. 82).
>
> 'There is more recorded evidence for the apostolic grasp of the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity than we usually suppose, and in the Pauline letters as well as in the Fourth Gospel there is a great deal of teaching which forms a sound basis for the double-procession doctrine' (p. 104).
>
> 'That was surely the inward meaning of Pentecost — the power and energy of the Spirit, dammed back from mankind, as it were, during the days of the human life of the divine Son, that the Son might occupy the field alone. . . .' (p. 128).
>
> 'John Baptist said that Jesus would baptize with Holy Spirit. This did not mean during His human life — at any rate it did not happen during His human life. Perhaps the fact that He did not baptize with water was symbolical of the fact that while incarnate He did not send the Spirit to man. That operation was reserved for a later stage—as St. John observed — when, back in glory, He would, together with the Father, send the Holy Spirit, which would proceed from both' (p. 138).

But Dr. Macdonald should be more careful of his orthodoxy. The following passage, with its explicit reference to three wills in the Godhead, is about as near to Tri-theism as anyone is likely to get and still hope to have his work published by the S.P.C.K. — at least, if St. Augustine is a guide in these matters:

> 'He (Jesus Christ) is the agent of revelation to us of the will of the Blessed Trinity — the Revealer of the will of the Father and Spirit as well as of His own will as Son' (p. 114).

The concluding chapters, on 'The Spirit and the World To-day' and 'The Spirit and the Individual To-day' are of a platitudinous and hortatory nature. Throughout the book the author assumes that the Divine Spirit operated in what can only be called an impersonal way. It is surprising that anyone of Dr. MacDonald's standing could produce this twenty-eight years after the appearance of Dr. Oman's *Grace and Personality*. A.W.A.

* *The Interpreter Spirit and Human Life*. By A. J. MacDonald, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 1944. 6/-.)

RELIGION, POLITICS AND ECONOMICS

Religion rightly claims to concern itself with politics and economics, for religion may not disinterest itself from any part of the complex of motives which actuate men in their various relations. Nevertheless, the saint may be a bad economist, nor does piety guarantee political competence. Rev. Mervyn Stockwood, missioner of the Blundell's School Mission, and Mr. J. Percival Davies, author of *The Politics of a Socialist Employer,* both of whom hold strong left wing views, have written books,* entitled respectively *There is a Tide* and *Glorious Banner*, which are concerned with the relationship between religion and economics.

Mr. Stockwood has no love for capitalism. 'I detest capitalism and all its manifold ramifications,' he writes. But he is far removed from dialectical or any other form of materialism. His socialism is primarily and emphatically Christian. He adds that he does not believe that a Labour Party 'which has ignored Truth for fictitious platitudes is capable of building a new England.' To aim simply at material benefits is to share the guilt of the money-changers in the Temple. Jesus, when tempted to turn stones into bread, 'knew that it is possible to have the best econmic system in the world and yet remain in hell.'

Though throughout his book the kind of economic reform in which he believes is never far from Mr. Stockwood's mind, the book is in the main an exposition of the Christian faith as formulated in the Apostles' Creed. Its style is lucid, vigorous and direct. Mr. Stockwood says that he may disturb the orthodox. His contention that literal belief in the Virgin Birth is not absolutely necessary and that the Incarnation is 'just as true,' even if Joseph was the natural father of Jesus, will hardly disturb anyone. It is nowadays a generally accepted commonplace. But some may be shocked when, of baptismal regeneration or the mystical washing away of sin, he says:

> 'I do not believe that there is any truth whatever in such an idea; on the contrary, it is harmful, superstitious and incompatible with human experience.'

Unfortunately, Mr. Stockwood seems to be strangely unaware that critical problems are involved in the use of the Gospel narratives. It is rather startling to find him treating the Fourth Gospel version of the Resurrection story as if it were unquestionably plain history. Still, much of his exposition is independent of factual detail.

Mr. Davies devotes a much greater proportion of his book to an attack on our present economic system. Then follows a more purely theological section, written from the standpoint of a very liberal type of Quakerism. The present system is unjust because far too few have in their hands far too much property and income. Social injustice is one of the main causes of war, for war is one of the easiest ways of counteracting the demand for social justice. When he comes to the teaching of Jesus, he equates the Kingdom of God with his socialist Utopia. His interpretation is the reverse of eschatological. The Kingdom is in effect a sound social system, and the duty of the Christian is to work and pray for its realization.

> 'And,' says Mr. Davies, 'it is no good mixing competition, production for profit, and private property together, and praying to God to make them into a sound social system.'

Mr. Davies grossly exaggerates the economic factor in the causation of war. The facts of history belie his theories. Bismarck waged three wars, not from economic motives, but in order to weld Germany into a unity under the leadership of Prussia. In this he succeeded. Germany did not go to war in 1914 because she was in an unfavourable economic position. On the contrary,

* *There is a Tide*, by Mervyn Stockwood (George Allen & Unwin Ltd. 1945. 6/-).
Glorious Banner, by J. Percival Davies (Pendle Books, Heys Farm, Guest House, West Bradford, Clitheroe. 1945. 2/-).

e was enjoying great prosperity and making vast industrial strides forward. r. Davies rides his hobby-horse so hard as to suggest that the mere exist- ce in England of a powerful party advocating Imperial Preference played great part in bringing about the war. His suggestion that Germany declared ar on Russia because a minority party in England advocated Tariff Reform rikes the reader as strange, the more so as Germany did not declare war England. It was England who declared war on Germany, and she did against the wish of the great financial interests which are Mr. Davies' gbear; for it is notorious that on August 1st, 1914, the Governor of the nk of England called on Mr. Lloyd George and told him that the trading d financial interests of the City of London were totally opposed to our tervention.

Now and then both Mr. Stockwood and Mr. Davies make general state- ents which require strict examination and some qualification. Mr. Davies, r example, gives a moving account of how, when looking at an Austrian llage war memorial, it was borne in on him that the Fritzes and Carls and ilhelms there commemorated were the Freds and Charlies and Willies of nglish villages. In fact, many of the Fritzes and Carls and Wilhelms of the st war were very different from their opposite numbers in England. When ements of the German 32nd Division entered Dinant on August 23rd, 1914, ey proceeded to massacre 674 of the civilian inhabitants. Against one wall ey shot 77 people, the oldest of whom was 88 years of age. Seven of them ere over 70 and 15 were children, one only three weeks old. The facts are record, undisputed and indisputable. It is an insult to our Freds and harlies and Willies to equate them with the Fritzes and Carls and Wilhelms no carried out the cold-blooded massacre of the Mad Bourbon. We might well say that our lads are the same as the successors of these Fritzes and arls and Wilhelms, the men of the S.S. and Gestapo, on the ground that ey have similar frames.

Mr. Stockwood asserts that

> 'The Englishman who is a Christian has more in common with the German who is a Christian than either has with a fellow-countryman who is not a Christian.'

certain ambiguity resides in the word Christian. Few, perhaps, would disposed to deny the appellation of Christian to the Roman Catholic hier- chy in Germany. Yet, in the fourth war-time letter issued by the German iscopate, when the whole free world was aghast at the tyranny and brutality German aggression, the bishops calmly said that at that moment the erman nation had risen economically politically and culturally to the highest vel ever attained by any western nation. In face of this statement most nglish Christians would feel that in important respects they had more in mmon with any decent secularist who retained some trace of moral judg- ent than with these German Christian bishops. As Germany began to epare for its second bid for world domination behind the facade of the eimar republic, so there is a real danger lest high-sounding religious plati- des and generalities may serve as a smoke-screen to hide from the eyes of e pious yet another attempt at a come-back.

Mr. Stockwood can be severe in his judgment of his fellow countrymen. e writes of the 'jubilant sermons' which greeted Mr. Chamberlain's activi- s at Munich:

> 'We applauded them,' he says, 'not because we were concerned with the fate of Czecho-Slovakia, but because we presumed that the unscrupu- lous expediency of the Prime Minister and his accomplices had saved our skins.'

t let us be fair. Such jubilation as there was may have proceeded from e mistaken belief that Munich had saved civilization from a world war. And t all sermons were jubilant.

G. L. H. HARVEY.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

Sir,

MODERN CHURCHMEN'S CONFERENCE, 1946.

The Twenty-ninth Conference of Modern Churchmen will be held at Westfield College, Hampstead, London, N.W.3, from September 16 to 21, 1946. The theme of the Conference is: *The Historic Jesus and His Gospel.*

Conference Tickets (including board and lodging) £3 15*s*. 0*d*., but a reduction of 5*s*. is made for assistant clergy, teachers and students.

Washing facilities, etc., in the College are such as are generally provided for students in Colleges.

Applications for tickets, accompanied by fees, should be made to the Hon. Secretary of the Conference, Miss Irene Walker,
Twemlow Hall, Holmes Chapel, via Crewe.

A MODERN CHURCHMEN'S BRAINS TRUST.

We have received a number of letters warmly supporting the suggestion, made in the correspondence pages of our June issue, that we should conduct a Modern Churchmen's Brains Trust. This we are prepared to attempt, should our readers send in questions. The name of the questioner will not be published but only the names of those who answer the questions. The Editor will act as Question Master.—Ed., *M.C.*

Sir,

'HO! EVERYONE THAT THIRSTETH.'

My term of office at Oxford has now come to an end and I should like it to be known that I am willing and able to go anywhere to conduct classes or give single lectures.

Owing to the generosity of the Modern Churchmen's Union, I need not quest any charge for expenses. Courses may be for any duration from three to twenty-four sessions. R. B. Henderson.

[The Syllabus of the three Courses of Lectures—(1) Theological Background, (2) The Old Testament, (3) The New Testament—is as attractive as it is comprehensive. Like the concertina, the courses can be expanded or compressed according to the needs of audiences. The Syllabus can be secured on application to the Lecturer, R. B. Henderson, M.A., B.D., Prior's Close, Bradford-on-Avon.—Ed., *M.C.*]

Sir,

PUBLIC LIBRARIES AND THE *MODERN CHURCHMAN.*

The Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union is anxious that as many public libraries as possible should be supplied with copies of the *Modern Churchman.* Each quarter's issue is quickly sold out, so that we have no alternative but to ask members when they have read their copies to invite the Librarians in their own towns to display them in the reading rooms under their care. The Council will appreciate the help of your readers in this way.

R. Gladstone Griffith,
Hon. Secretary, M.C.U.

[Mrs. Walter Versfeld, Stawel Klip, Piquetberg, C.P., South Africa, would value recent issues of the *Modern Churchman* for a branch of the Modern Churchmen's Union being formed in her locality.—Ed., *M.C.*]

THE RESURRECTION

As we are publishing in this issue of the *Modern Churchman* a second article on the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, we are unable to find room for several letters dealing with that subject.—Ed., *M.C.*